

By Mr. BUTLER: A bill (H. R. 11282) to authorize an increase in the limits of cost of certain naval vessels; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. HILL of Maryland: A bill (H. R. 11283) to amend section 205 of the Revised Statutes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. VESTAL: A bill (H. R. 11284) to define the status of retired officers of the Regular Army who have been or may be detailed as professors and assistant professors of military science and tactics at educational institutions; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. DYER: A bill (H. R. 11285) to extend the time for the completion of the municipal bridge approaches, and extensions or additions thereto, by the city of St. Louis, within the States of Illinois and Missouri; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. GREEN: Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 315) proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. REID of Illinois: Resolution (H. Res. 390) for the appointment of a committee of five Members of the House of Representatives by the Speaker of the House to investigate a series of articles in the Liberty Magazine entitled "The Woodrow Wilson I Knew," by Mary Allen Hulbert; to the Committee on Rules.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ALMON: A bill (H. R. 11286) granting a pension to Mae L. Cornell; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. ANTHONY: A bill (H. R. 11287) granting a pension to Winnie Turner; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 11288) granting a pension to Frank Siddall; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 11289) granting a pension to Belle Cochran; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 11290) granting an increase of pension to Laura E. Franklin; to Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. BURDICK: A bill (H. R. 11291) authorizing the President of the United States to restore Gunner Harold McCutcheon, United States Navy, retired, to the active list of the United States Navy; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. CANFIELD: A bill (H. R. 11292) for the relief of Jacob Shuey; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. DYER: A bill (H. R. 11293) for the relief of Willie Hutchinson; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. HICKEY: A bill (H. R. 11294) granting a pension to Angeline C. Stuck; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. McDUFFIE: A bill (H. R. 11295) for the relief of Kate T. Riley; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. MERRITT: A bill (H. R. 11296) for the relief of Carl C. Back as the father and legal guardian of Gunther Carl Back; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. MOORE of Ohio: A bill (H. R. 11297) granting a pension to Cora O. Russell; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. MORGAN: A bill (H. R. 11298) granting an increase of pension to Mary Ellen Montis; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. REID of Illinois: A bill (H. R. 11299) granting a pension to Julia H. Piatt; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 11300) granting a pension to Charles E. Kidder; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. ROACH: A bill (H. R. 11301) granting a pension to Alamanza Korson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. ROBSON of Kentucky: A bill (H. R. 11302) granting an increase of pension to Mary Powell; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. SANDERS of New York: A bill (H. R. 11303) granting an increase of pension to Melia A. Parker; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. SMITH: A bill (H. R. 11304) granting a pension to James Lloyd; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. WASON: A bill (H. R. 11305) granting an increase of pension to Sarah F. Buck; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 11306) granting a pension to Charles H. Putnam; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. WURZBACH: A bill (H. R. 11307) granting a pension to Lewis C. Sparkman; to the Committee on Pensions.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

3341. By the SPEAKER (by request): Petition of the members of Temple Class of Methodist Episcopal Church, Yakima, Wash., favoring the distribution of literature by Congress to all schools and colleges and the incorporation of instruction in narcotics; also from the Ladies' Aid, of Rhodes, Iowa; to the Committee on Printing.

3342. By Mr. DAVEY: Petition of citizens of Lorain County, Ohio, against the passage of Senate bill 3218; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

3343. By Mr. GALLIVAN: Petition of the Massachusetts Federation of Churches, urging Congress to repeal the Japanese exclusion clause of the immigration act; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

3344. Also, petition of D. Eddy & Sons Co., Boston, Mass., recommending congressional action looking toward the development of a national policy of flood control; to the Committee on Flood Control.

3345. By Mr. GIBSON: Petition of citizens of Jamaica, Vt., protesting against proposed legislation (S. 3218) for the compulsory observance of Sunday; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

3346. By Mr. LEACH: Petition of residents of Attleboro, Mass., opposed to the passage of the Sunday observance bill (S. 3218); to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

3347. By Mr. MAGEE of New York: Petition of members of the Seventh Day Adventist Church, of Syracuse, N. Y., in opposition to Sunday observance bill (S. 3218); to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

3348. By Mr. O'CONNELL of Rhode Island: Petition of residents of Pawtucket and vicinity, protesting against the passage of compulsory Sunday observance bill (S. 3218); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3349. By Mr. O'CONNELL of New York: Petition of the Col. E. H. Liscum Garrison, No. 46, Army and Navy Union, of Elmira, N. Y., favoring the passage of House bill 5934, pension bill; to the Committee on Pensions.

3350. By Mr. RAKER: Petition of W. H. Wharton, chairman Arthur McArthur Camp, United Spanish War Veterans, Department of Minnesota, urging support of House bill 5934; to the Committee on Pensions.

3351. By Mr. WINGO: Petition of Joseph L. Neal Camp, United Confederate Veterans, Nashville, Ark., indorsing bill introduced by Representative John N. Tillman, known as the cotton tax refund measure; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

SENATE

MONDAY, January 5, 1925

The Chaplain, Rev. J. J. Muir, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Our Father, we love to call Thee by that name. Though Thou art the great and mighty God who inhabiteth eternity, Thou dost come to us closely in happy relationship and Thou dost want us to call ourselves the children of such a Father. Accept our thanks for all the mercies received. Grant us Thy grace through this day, and may it be a day hallowed by the associations of yesterday and a day in which duty shall be well done. We ask in Jesus' name. Amen.

The reading clerk proceeded to read the Journal of the proceedings of the legislative day of Friday last when, on request of Mr. JONES of Washington and by unanimous consent, the further reading was dispensed with and the Journal was approved.

INVESTIGATION OF NORTHERN PACIFIC LAND GRANTS

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair announces the appointment of the junior Senator from Arkansas [Mr. CARAWAY] as a member of the committee on the part of the Senate under the provisions of section 3 of the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 237) directing the Secretary of the Interior to withhold his approval of the adjustment of the Northern Pacific land grants, and for other purposes, the appointment of the Senator from Arkansas being in the stead of Mr. Adams, who has ceased to be a member of this body.

SENATOR FROM TEXAS

Mr. MAYFIELD presented the certificate of the Governor of the State of Texas, certifying to the election of MORRIS SHEP-

PARD as a Senator from that State for the term beginning on the 4th day of March, 1925, which was read and ordered to be filed, as follows:

Certificate of Election

THE STATE OF TEXAS,

This is to certify that at a general election held in the State of Texas for United States Senate on the first Tuesday after the first Monday in November, A. D. 1924, being the 4th day of said month, MORRIS SHEPPARD, having received the highest number of votes cast for any person at said election for the office hereinafter named, was duly elected as Senator for the State of Texas.

In testimony whereof, I have hereunto subscribed my name and caused the seal of State to be affixed at the city of Austin on this the 23d day of December, A. D. 1924.

By the Governor:
[SEAL.]

PAT M. NEFF, Governor,
J. J. STRICKLAND,
Secretary of State.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

Mr. STERLING. Mr. President, I present a petition and resolution of the Federation Council of the Churches of Christ in South Dakota in behalf of a court of international justice, and ask that the letter and the resolution be referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations and printed in the Record.

There being no objection, the letter and resolution were referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations and ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

THE FEDERATION COUNCIL OF THE CHURCHES
OF CHRIST IN SOUTH DAKOTA,
Aberdeen, S. Dak., January 1, 1925.

Hon. THOMAS STERLING,
Senator from South Dakota,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: I am authorized to send you the inclosed resolution adopted by the Federation Council of Churches of Christ in South Dakota. We believe that our representatives in Washington appreciate knowing our feelings in regard to as important an action as this. We believe that our entrance into the World Court will hasten the time when we may have world peace, for which we are hoping and praying.

Sincerely yours,

H. C. JUELL.

The Federation Council of Churches of Christ in South Dakota, representing most of the Protestant denominations in the State, have unanimously adopted the resolution appearing below, and have signed this resolution with a petition that it be sent to Secretary Charles E. Hughes, and the Senators and Representatives from South Dakota.

Resolution

The Federation Council of Churches of Christ in South Dakota most heartily indorse the proposals of President Calvin Coolidge in his addresses to Congress on December 6, 1923, and December 3, 1924, favoring the participation of the United States in the Court of International Justice. We believe this to be the right and Christian way to settle differences between nations. The Federation Council of Churches of Christ in South Dakota therefore petition Congress to take such action as is necessary for our Nation to become a member of this World Court.

Rev. GAY C. WHITE, D. D.,
President, Superintendent of Mitchell District for the
Methodist Episcopal Church.
Rev. DAVID J. FERRIN, D. D.,
First Vice Superintendent of the Congregational
Churches of South Dakota.
Rev. A. PIERCE WALTZ,
Second Vice Pastor of the Baptist Church at Ipswich, S. Dak.
Rev. G. E. BOHNER,
Third Vice Superintendent of the Evangelical Churches
of South Dakota.
Rev. D. M. BUTT,
Fourth Vice Retired, Former Superintendent of the
Aberdeen District of the Presbyterian Church.
Rev. H. P. CARSON, D. D.,
Treasurer, Stated Clerk for the South Dakota
Synod of the Presbyterian Church.
Rev. H. C. JUELL,
Secretary, Assistant Superintendent of the
Congregational Churches of South Dakota.

Mr. STERLING also presented a petition of sundry citizens of Hurley and Turner County, S. Dak., praying for the participation of the United States in the Permanent Court of International Justice, which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

Mr. BROOKHART presented a memorial of sundry citizens of Van Buren County, in the State of Iowa, remonstrating against the passage of legislation providing for compulsory Sunday observance in the District of Columbia, which was referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts. I present a telegram from the Christian Science Monitor relative to postal rates, which I ask to have treated as in the nature of a petition, printed in the Record, and referred to the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads.

There being no objection, the telegram was referred to the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads and ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

BOSTON, MASS., January 4, 1925.

Senator DAVID I. WALSH,
Senate Office Building, Washington, D. C.:

In its present form the postal bill, which would reduce postage on most newspapers, would increase domestic postage on the Christian Science Monitor from \$95,000 a year to \$239,000 a year, an increase of over 150 per cent. The Monitor is issued by the Christian Science Publishing Society, an unincorporated trusteeship auxiliary to the Christian Science Mother Church. The Monitor is published at a loss. If it produced net earnings, they would accrue to the church, not to any individual. Under existing law Monitor is exempt from zone rates because maintained in interest of religious organization and not for private profit. Zone system would be peculiarly burdensome to Monitor because its circulation, unlike that of most newspapers, is not local but nation-wide. An amendment consisting of section 1103 of war revenue law would meet this situation. We request your cooperation in securing this amendment.

THE CHRISTIAN SCIENCE PUBLISHING SOCIETY.

Mr. NORBECK presented the memorial of G. E. Loomis and 34 other citizens of Colton, S. Dak., remonstrating against the passage of legislation providing for compulsory Sunday observance in the District of Columbia, which was referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

Mr. DILL presented two memorials, numerous signed, by sundry citizens in the State of Washington, remonstrating against the passage of legislation providing for compulsory Sunday observance in the District of Columbia, which were referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

Mr. JOHNSON of California presented sundry memorials, numerous signed, by citizens of Bakersfield, San Jose, Santa Clara, Sacramento, San Martin, Hanford, Shafter, and Los Angeles, all in the State of California, and of Fallon, Nev., remonstrating against the passage of legislation providing for compulsory Sunday observance in the District of Columbia, which were referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

REPORTS OF THE MILITARY AFFAIRS COMMITTEE

Mr. WADSWORTH, from the Committee on Military Affairs, to which was referred the bill (S. 3760) to amend in certain particulars the national defense act of June 3, 1916, as amended, and for other purposes, reported it with amendments and submitted a report (No. 842) thereon.

Mr. FLETCHER, from the Committee on Military Affairs, to which was referred the bill (S. 3631) for the relief of Augustus Sipple, submitted an adverse report thereon.

COURTS IN IOWA

Mr. CUMMINS. From the Committee on the Judiciary I report back favorably without amendment the bill (S. 3792) to amend section 81 of the Judicial Code, and I ask for its immediate consideration.

I will briefly explain the character of the bill. It merely proposes changes in the times for holding courts in certain divisions of the southern district of Iowa. It was prepared carefully by the judge of that court, whom many Senators know.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. ODDIE in the chair). Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, proceeded to consider the bill. It proposes that the fifth paragraph of section 81 of the Judicial Code be amended to read as follows:

Terms of the district court for the eastern division shall be held at Keokuk on the fourteenth Tuesday after the second Tuesday in January and the eighth Tuesday after the third Tuesday in September; for the central division, at Des Moines on the fifteenth Tuesday after the second Tuesday in January and the tenth Tuesday after the third Tuesday in September; for the western division, at Council Bluffs on the second Tuesday after the second Tuesday in January and the second Tuesday after the third Tuesday in September; for the southern division, at Creston on the fourth Tuesday after the

third Tuesday in September and the second Tuesday in January; for the Davenport division, at Davenport on the twelfth Tuesday after the second Tuesday in January and the sixth Tuesday after the third Tuesday in September; and for the Ottumwa division, at Ottumwa on the first Tuesday after the second Tuesday in January and the third Tuesday in September.

The bill was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

WASHINGTON HOSPITAL FOR FOUNDLINGS

Mr. CUMMINS. I further report from the Committee on the Judiciary favorably without amendment the bill (S. 3733) to enlarge the powers of the Washington Hospital for Foundlings and to enable it to accept the devise and bequest contained in the will of Randolph T. Warwick. I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill. It is simply designed to enlarge the powers of the Washington Hospital for Foundlings, a corporation organized by the act of Congress approved April 22, 1870, so as to enable the hospital to accept a bequest of \$600,000 attempted to be given to it by the will of Mr. Warwick.

The bill has received the unanimous approval of the Committee on the Judiciary, and I am sure there can be no objection to it on the part of any Senator.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, proceeded to consider the bill. It proposes to amend the act incorporating a hospital for foundlings in the city of Washington, approved April 22, 1870, and amended March 3, 1909, by inserting in lieu of section 5 of that act of incorporation the following:

Sec. 5. The object of this association is to found in the city of Washington a hospital for the reception and support of destitute and friendless children, and for the erection and maintenance of a memorial building to be known as the Helen L. and Mary E. Warwick Memorial for the care and treatment of foundlings and for the care and treatment of women afflicted with cancer; and that said association be, and the same is hereby, authorized and empowered to receive, accept, and hold the bequest and devise contained in the will of Randolph T. Warwick, deceased, of the District of Columbia.

The bill was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

ANNIVERSARY OF THE BATTLE OF LEXINGTON AND CONCORD

Mr. WARREN. From the Committee on Appropriations I report back favorably without amendment the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 259) establishing a commission for the participation of the United States in the observance of the one hundred and fiftieth anniversary of the Battle of Lexington and Concord, authorizing an appropriation to be utilized in connection with such observance, and for other purposes.

The joint resolution, which has passed the House of Representatives, provides for steps to be taken to enable the Government to participate in a celebration in commemoration of the anniversary of the Battle of Lexington and Concord. It makes no appropriation, but merely provides that there may be a small amount appropriated hereafter. As the time is quite near for the celebration of the anniversary of that battle, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the joint resolution.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the immediate consideration of the joint resolution?

Mr. ROBINSON. Mr. President, I desire to ask the Senator from Wyoming a question. The Senator has stated that the joint resolution carries no appropriation but merely authorizes an appropriation. In what amount does it authorize an appropriation?

Mr. WARREN. It authorizes an appropriation of \$5,000, or so much thereof as may be necessary for the expenses of the commission in connection with the celebration. The joint resolution also provides that there may be an additional \$10,000 appropriated, which would make \$15,000 in the aggregate, to enable the United States to take part in the celebration; but the joint resolution really only carries the authority to appropriate and makes no appropriation.

Mr. ROBINSON. The total appropriation contemplated is \$15,000?

Mr. WARREN. That is correct.

There being no objection, the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, proceeded to consider the joint resolution, which was read, as follows:

Resolved, etc. That there is hereby established a commission to be known as the United States Lexington-Concord Sesquicentennial Commission (hereinafter referred to as the commission) and to be composed of 11 commissioners, as follows: Three persons to be appointed by the President of the United States, four Senators by the President of the Senate, and four Members of the House of Representatives by the Speaker of the House of Representatives. The commission shall serve without compensation and shall select a chairman from among their number.

Sec. 2. That there is hereby authorized to be appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the sum of \$5,000 to be expended by the commission for actual and necessary traveling expenses and subsistence while discharging its official duties outside the District of Columbia.

Sec. 3. That there is hereby authorized to be appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the sum of \$10,000 to be utilized in the discretion of the commission for the appropriate participation on the part of the United States in the celebration and observance of the one hundred and fiftieth anniversary of the Battle of Lexington and Concord to be commemorated on or about April 19 and 20, 1925.

Sec. 4. That the Postmaster General is hereby authorized and directed to issue a special series of postage stamps, in such denominations and of such designs as he may determine, commemorative of the one hundred and fiftieth anniversary of the Battle of Lexington and Concord and of the one hundred and fiftieth anniversary of such other major events of the Revolutionary War as he may deem appropriate.

Sec. 5. That in commemoration of the one hundred and fiftieth anniversary of the Battle of Lexington and Concord there shall be coined at the mints of the United States silver 50-cent pieces to the number of 300,000, such 50-cent pieces to be of the standard troy weight, composition, diameter, device, and design as shall be fixed by the Director of the Mint, with the approval of the Secretary of the Treasury, which said 50-cent pieces shall be legal tender in any payment to the amount of their face value.

Sec. 6. That all laws now in force relating to the subsidiary silver coins of the United States and the coining or striking of the same, regulating and guarding the process of coining, providing for the purchase of material, and for the transportation, distribution, and redemption of the coins, for the prevention of debasement or counterfeiting, for security of the coin, or for any other purposes, whether said laws are penal or otherwise, shall, so far as applicable, apply to the coinage herein authorized: *Provided*, That the United States shall not be subject to the expense of making the necessary dies and other preparations for this coinage.

The joint resolution was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

BILLS INTRODUCED

Bills were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. JONES of Washington:

A bill (S. 3836) to amend and supplement the merchant marine act, 1920, the shipping act, 1916, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce.

By Mr. SHEPPARD:

A bill (S. 3837) for the purchase of land adjoining Fort Bliss, Tex.; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. SHIPSTEAD:

A bill (S. 3838) to authorize the President, in certain cases, to modify visé requirements; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

By Mr. LADD:

A bill (S. 3839) to repeal the act approved January 27, 1922, providing for change of entry, and for other purposes; and

A bill (S. 3840) authorizing the President of the United States to restore to the public domain lands reserved by public proclamation as national monuments, and validating any such restorations heretofore so made by Executive order; to the Committee on Public Lands and Surveys.

By Mr. FRAZIER:

A bill (S. 3841) to amend and supplement the packers and stockyards act, 1921; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

By Mr. WILLIS:

A bill (S. 3842) granting an increase of pension to Jane E. Davis (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. NORBECK:

A bill (S. 3843) to authorize the creation of a national memorial in the Harney National Forest; to the Committee on Public Lands and Surveys.

By Mr. JOHNSON of California:

A bill (S. 3844) granting a pension to Elizabeth Ritchie; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. DILL:

A bill (S. 3845) granting a pension to Mary Holst; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. COPELAND:

A bill (S. 3846) for the relief of the Snare & Triest Co.; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. BURSUM:

A bill (S. 3847) granting a pension to John Griffin; and
A bill (S. 3848) granting a pension to Arthur S. Goodell; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. TRAMMELL:

A bill (S. 3849) for the relief of J. W. Braxton; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. CAPPER:

A bill (S. 3850) for the relief of Mark J. White; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. MCKINLEY:

A bill (S. 3851) granting a pension to Harry Brown; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. ELKINS:

A bill (S. 3852) granting a pension to Lucy A. Rowles; to the Committee on Pensions.

BILLS RECOMMENDED

On motion of Mr. OVERMAN, the bill (S. 292) to incorporate the American Bar Association and the bill (S. 3213) to incorporate the American War Mothers, were recommended to the Committee on the Judiciary.

RECLASSIFICATION OF POSTAL SALARIES

Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts. Mr. President, I present an amendment to the bill (S. 3674) reclassifying the salaries of postmasters and employees of the Postal Service, readjusting their salaries and compensation on an equitable basis, increasing postal rates to provide for such readjustment, and for other purposes. I ask that the amendment may be printed and lie on the table. In connection with the amendment, I ask that there may be printed in the RECORD a letter from the National Editorial Association dated January 3, 1925, and addressed to me.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NATIONAL EDITORIAL ASSOCIATION,
Wareham, Mass., January 3, 1925.

Hon. DAVID I. WALSH,
United States Senate.

DEAR SIR: The clause in the pending post office revenue bill which places an additional advertising tax on newspapers to pay postal employees' increased salaries is unjust and burdensome, especially as applied to weekly (local) newspapers. In papers of that class the advertising is merely incidental in copies sent out of the immediate locality in which they are published and has no value to the advertisers whose trade is entirely local. Such copies as we send out of the locality are for their news content wholly, the distant subscribers being in no wise interested in the advertising.

Local weekly papers should not be classed with magazines and papers having a nation-wide circulation.

A fair proposition would be to exempt all local weeklies of less than 5,000 circulation from any increase in the advertising tax which is now being unjustly paid.

Trusting that the matter will receive your careful consideration, I remain,

Yours respectfully,

L. C. HALL.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The amendment intended to be proposed by the Senator from Massachusetts will be printed and lie on the table.

The amendment was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

On page 38 of Senate bill 3674, line 24, after the word "advertisements," insert the following: "and all local weekly publications of less than 5,000 circulation."

Mr. BUTLER submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill (S. 3674) reclassifying the salaries of postmasters and employees of the Postal Service, readjusting their salaries and compensation on an equitable basis, increasing postal rates to provide for such readjustment, and for other purposes, which was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

AMENDMENTS TO RIVER AND HARBOR BILLS

Mr. SHEPPARD submitted three amendments intended to be proposed by him to the bill (H. R. 10894) authorizing the construction, repair, and preservation of certain public works

on rivers and harbors, and for other purposes, which were referred to the Committee on Commerce and ordered to be printed.

Mr. RANDELL submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill (H. R. 9672) authorizing the construction, repair, and preservation of certain public works on rivers and harbors, and for other purposes, which was referred to the Committee on Commerce and ordered to be printed.

PACIFIC COMMISSARY CO.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the amendment of the House of Representatives to the bill (S. 2357) for the relief of the Pacific Commissary Co., which was, on page 1, line 7, to strike out "\$31,847.87" and insert "\$8,931.59."

Mr. CAPPER. I move that the Senate disagree to the House amendment, ask for a conference, and that the Chair appoint the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The motion was agreed to; and the President pro tempore appointed Mr. CAPPER, Mr. STANFIELD, and Mr. BAYARD conferees on the part of the Senate.

JANIE BEASLEY GLISSON

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the amendment of the House of Representatives to the bill (S. 648) for the relief of Janie Beasley Glisson, which was, on page 1, line 6, to strike out "\$5,000" and insert "\$2,500."

Mr. HARRIS. I move that the Senate concur in the House amendment.

The motion was agreed to.

ELEVATION OF GUNS ON AMERICAN BATTLESHIPS

Mr. GERRY. Mr. President, I submit a resolution and ask that it may be read and referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

The resolution (S. Res. 290) was read, as follows:

Resolved, That the Secretary of State be, and he hereby is, requested to furnish to the Senate full information regarding protests received from any power against the elevation of the guns on the battleships of the United States.

Mr. GERRY. Mr. President, I desire to state in connection with the resolution which I have just submitted that I tried to obtain the information for which it calls from the Secretary of the Navy but was unsuccessful. However, when I brought the matter up in the Naval Affairs Committee, and stated that I had done so, there was a newspaper report the next day, which apparently emanated from the White House, that there had been protests of a certain power against the elevation of the guns of our battleships, but that that matter would not be taken up until Congress had legislated on the subject. To my mind, it is most important—and I feel that Members of the Senate will so consider it—that we should have this information as to what protests have been made, and, if protests have been made against the elevation of guns on American battleships, of what those protests consist; so that the Senate may determine whether or not there is any treaty violation before we should pass upon legislation for the elevation of the guns of our battleships. I ask that the resolution may be referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

Mr. HALE. Mr. President, in reply to the suggestion of the Senator from Rhode Island, let me say that the House Committee on Naval Affairs has made a request of the Secretary of State for the same correspondence referred to by the Senator from Rhode Island, and I understand that a reply from the Secretary of State to the House committee will be made to-day or to-morrow, or, at any rate, within a few days.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The resolution will be referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

CONSTRUCTION OF COMMERCIAL AIRCRAFT BY GERMANY

Mr. COPELAND submitted a resolution (S. Res. 291), which was read and referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations, as follows:

Whereas the Council of Ambassadors on May 5, 1922, permitted Germany to resume the construction of commercial aircraft, and publicly declared its purpose of revising, within two years, the restriction imposed by them relative to the definition of what constitutes commercial aircraft as differentiated from military aircraft; and

Whereas there has been no public announcement of any such revision; and

Whereas the interests of present-day aeronautics demand the fulfillment of such promised revision: Now therefore be it

Resolved, That the Executive Department be requested to ascertain from the Council of Ambassadors its present attitude toward such promised revision and to inform the Senate thereof, if not inconsistent with our national interests.

TRADE BETWEEN THE UNITED STATES AND RUSSIA

Mr. BORAH. Mr. President, I ask permission to have printed in the RECORD the Associated Press dispatch of Saturday last with reference to trade between the United States and Russia, and also to have printed in connection with that dispatch a letter from Mr. Joseph Newburger, of Memphis, Tenn., touching the subject matter of our trade with Russia. There being no objection, the matter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD as follows:

[From the Evening Star, Washington, D. C., Saturday, January 3, 1925]

UNITED STATES TRADE WITH RUSSIA, 50 PER CENT GREATER THAN IN
CZARIST DAYS, TOTALS \$63,000,000

(By the Associated Press)

NEW YORK, January 3.—The United States did 50 per cent more business with Soviet Russia in 1924 without official recognition than with czarist Russia before the war, according to claims made by soviet representatives here to-day.

The soviet's three principal trading companies here footed up their ledgers for the 12 months ending December 31 last to report a trade turnover through their hands between the two countries of \$63,416,147. They then added 10 per cent to cover transactions presumably concluded in Moscow, Berlin, London, and other European centers, making an estimated total of \$69,757,761. This exceeded by \$23,257,761 the pre-war turnover in Russian-American trade of about \$46,500,000.

The present turnover of \$69,757,761 represented actual exports from the United States to Russia of \$52,692,549 and imports of \$10,723,598, leaving an apparent trade balance in favor of this country of about \$41,968,951, according to the books.

The three concerns are the All-Russian Textile Syndicate (Inc.), the Amtorg Corporation, and Centrosyuz America (Inc.).

Cotton was the principal item of exports from the United States. According to the figures of All-Russian Textile Syndicate (Inc.), its chief handler, the amount shipped was 265,845 bales, valued at \$42,700,000. A fleet of 26 vessels was chartered to transport these cargoes to Murmansk. Remittances of money were reported received here from Moscow via England. Bankers and brokers in London were said to collect a fee for acting as go-between for the two countries.

Furs, the principal item of imports from Russia, were estimated at more than \$8,000,000.

The Soviet Union had drawn up a plan by which Russia's cotton crop was to have caught up with the demand for staple by its textile industry some time in 1926. The cotton mills, however, it now is reported officially, have expanded too rapidly for these calculations.

NEWBURGER COTTON CO. (INC.),
Memphis, Tenn., November 17, 1924.

Senator WILLIAM E. BORAH,
Senate Office Building, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR: It is with great pleasure that I read in the papers that you intend to push the recognition of Russia. Your idea is exactly correct; it matters not what kind of a government they have, it is no question of ours. They comprise one-sixth of the globe; they are valuable in trading with America, and I believe the association of our people with the Russians will bring them to realize exactly what Lenin was trying to do before his death—induce capital to come to Russia and protect it. I believe the thing that will destroy communistic ideas is for the whole world to recognize Russia, start trading with them, break down the barrier of passports, go into Russia, and meet the people.

I visited Russia 25 years ago. I was in Russia just before the war, and I made a visit there last summer. I herewith inclose you copy of my interview in Commerce and Finance.

The South is deeply interested because Russia will buy from us, if diplomatic relations can be established through recognition, 500,000 bales of cotton, representing \$400,000,000. They will also purchase farm machinery, electrical appliances, and other manufactured products to the extent of \$200,000,000, and export to us platinum and several other products indigenous to Russia.

Taking the broad view of the situation, I can't understand how our country can be opposed to recognition of Russia. If you can not do anything further you should establish a trade agreement. While I was in Russia several leading men expressed to me their earnest desire to sit around and discuss problems over a table. I have always said that a man who won't submit to an arbitration does not want to do the right thing. These people want to be heard. In every question there are two sides. Let's hear them and decide the case upon its merits.

With best wishes,
Sincerely,

JOSEPH NEWBURGER.

RIVER AND HARBOR IMPROVEMENTS

Mr. FLETCHER. Mr. President, I ask to have printed in the RECORD a short article appearing in to-day's Washington Post entitled "The river and harbor bill," by the Chief of Engineers.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE RIVER AND HARBOR BILL

To the EDITOR OF THE POST.

SIR: In your issue of December 22, 1924, under the caption of "Progress and Pork," you discuss, editorially, the river and harbor improvement bill, which is now pending in Congress.

Your editorial was evidently written under a misapprehension as to the character of the bill referred to. You speak of the bill as if it carried an appropriation of \$55,000,000. The bill to which you refer does not carry one dollar of appropriations. It authorizes certain improvements to be carried on with funds which are to be appropriated in the future. As it now reads, even if it should become a law at once, no money can be expended during the fiscal year ending June 30, 1926, on any of the projects which would be authorized. The question of providing funds for carrying on these projects, should they be authorized, will come up again next year before the Director of the Budget and before the appropriations committees of Congress, who may or may not provide funds for the carrying on of the projects as they see fit.

You state in your editorial: "If as a matter of convenience or for any other reason it is desirable to put a number of appropriation items in a single bill, then it is desirable to invest the President with the power to approve certain items and veto others." The present custom is for Congress to make a lump-sum appropriation for carrying on river and harbor improvements authorized by Congress, and the allotments from this lump-sum appropriation to the separate projects are made by the Secretary of War upon the recommendation of the Chief of Engineers of the Army. If there are any projects in the pending authorization bill upon which work should not be carried on, it is only necessary for the President to indicate to the Secretary of War that no allotments for these projects should be made. This is a much simpler procedure than even a veto to eliminate any undesirable projects, as a mere indication from the President that such and such a project should be eliminated from the allotment list would be sufficient, and there would be no possibility of such a notice being overruled.

In recommending allotments from the lump-sum appropriation, the Chief of Engineers considers only the needs of commerce, and I can state with absolute, positive knowledge that in the past four years, since the present system has been in vogue, no allotment has been made to any project in the United States for any "back-scratching" purposes. It is absolutely impossible for "the Member from Way-back" under the system now in force, to do any trading, as you state, and neither the "Washington Navy Yard" nor "Wildcat Creek" are allotted money unless navigation interests justify it; but if navigation interests do justify it, both get such sums as are necessary so long as the funds appropriated by Congress are available for allotment.

H. TAYLOR,
Major General, Chief of Engineers.

WAR DEPARTMENT, December 30.

SMUGGLING OF ALIENS

Mr. ASHURST. Mr. President, I now lay before the Senate information regarding the smuggling of aliens into the United States across the southwestern border. I request the Clerk to read an editorial from the Washington Post upon the subject of the smuggling of aliens.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Clerk will read as requested.

The reading clerk read as follows:

[Washington Post December 25, 1924]

SMUGGLING OF ALIENS

The smuggling of aliens into the United States across the Mexican and Canadian borders has reached intolerable proportions. It is an industry that threatens to become as powerful as the bootlegging of liquor. Both of these dangerous growths are the effects of badly constructed laws.

It was a mistake to close the ports of the United States to aliens while leaving the borders open to smuggling. The purpose of Congress in excepting Canada and Mexico from the quota law was to interfere as little as possible with the legitimate flow of travel across the borders. But the result has been to leave a loophole through which thousands of criminal and diseased aliens are brought into this country. Once inside they can not be detected.

If it is impossible or impracticable to apply the quota rule to Canada and Mexico, the registration of aliens should at least be re-

quired. Registration, indeed, is desirable even if the quota rule should also be applied.

No alien should be permitted to remain in the United States unless he has been lawfully admitted. The only method of ascertaining whether an alien is lawfully in the country is by requiring him to produce a registration card proving his identity. If lawfully admitted, he is a desirable addition to the population. He may occasionally be subjected to annoyance under the registration system, but this will be a small price to pay for the sake of keeping the country free of criminal and diseased interlopers. The cost of the registration system would be an added burden upon the Government, but it would not be as costly as the increasing expense of patrolling the borders, prosecuting smugglers, and deporting smuggled aliens.

Mr. ASHURST. On April 2 of this year I introduced the following resolution:

Resolved, That the Secretary of Labor be hereby directed to transmit to the Senate a statement furnishing complete information as to the number of nationals of Mexico admitted into the United States during the past 12 months.

The Senate on June 5, 1924, agreed to this resolution. The Secretary of the Senate advises me, however, that the Secretary of Labor has made no response to the resolution to which the Senate agreed.

Believing that possibly the copy of this resolution which was transmitted to the Secretary of Labor might have been lost in the mails between here and the Department of Labor, which is more than a mile away, I wrote a letter to the Secretary of Labor on December 27 last, as follows:

DECEMBER 27, 1924.

To the honorable the SECRETARY OF LABOR,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. SECRETARY: On April 2, 1924, I introduced the resolution, copy of which is herewith inclosed. Later the Senate struck off the preamble to the resolution and adopted the same in accordance with lines 1, 2, 3, 4, and 5, on page 2 thereof, but the Secretary of the Senate advises me that your department has made no response to the Senate looking toward furnishing the data requested by the resolution.

Possibly the Secretary of the Senate did not transmit this resolution to your department, but I wish you would supply me with the information at the earliest possible date, and I suppose as soon as the information is compiled you will send the same to the Senate.

With esteem, respectfully yours,

HENRY F. ASHURST.

Mr. President, the resolution was favorably reported by the Senate Committee on Education and Labor. It was unanimously agreed to on the 5th of June, and Senators will perceive that it relates to an important subject.

I charge that large numbers of aliens, persons unauthorized to come into the United States, are being smuggled annually by the hundreds, possibly by the thousands, into the United States, and that while we are supposed to have an immigration law we have, in truth, a funnel, a conduit through which hundreds, yea, thousands, of unauthorized persons are poured annually into the United States.

Grave as that question is, another important question has been raised. May the head of one of the departments of Government, when the Senate formally calls for information, disregard the resolution of the Senate? I pass by the failure on the part of the Secretary to reply to my letter; of that I make no particular complaint. But should the Senate in silence pass over the subject? I therefore move that the Secretary of Labor be respectfully requested, if not incompatible with the public interest, to furnish to the Senate the information requested by the Senate resolution which was passed on June 5, 1924.

Mr. REED of Pennsylvania. Mr. President, the resolution of the Senator from Arizona was passed June 5, two days before the Senate adjourned. On the day the Senate reconvened, December 1, we had the annual report of the Commissioner General of Immigration sent to us by the President, and that gave the information the Senator's resolution asked for, stating that 87,048 Mexicans came into the United States during the 12 months of the fiscal year 1923-24.

I am sure the Secretary of Labor has not meant to ignore the resolution. I believe he felt that the annual report about which I speak gave the information, although I know he would be glad to send it to the Senator personally in response to his letter.

Mr. ASHURST. The reply of the Senator from Pennsylvania is a sensible reply. It does not appear to me, however, that an annual report is an answer to a resolution of the Senate. We know that the department sends in each year its report. If the resolutions which we introduce and pass may be con-

sidered to be answered and replied to in the reports submitted annually, then of course the Secretary of Labor is justified in ignoring the Senate's resolution. This is the first time in my service of 13 years that a Cabinet officer disregarded such a matter and refused to reply directly. I wish a direct reply in addition to what has been said in the annual report.

I say again that I pass over as unworthy of serious consideration the refusal to reply to my own letter because, possibly, the Secretary of Labor had not returned from South America. With due deference to the Senator from Pennsylvania, I feel that the Senate ought to have a direct response.

The Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. REED] is a valuable acquisition to the Senate. He votes his judgment, and no lash, no whip from the White House, will make him cringe. He has dared to vote his views, therefore I know he is not speaking as the official defender of the administration or as the official defender of the Secretary of Labor, because he has the courage to vote against them when he sees fit. I believe that when the Senate passes a resolution, especially upon a subject so important, the departments ought not to tell us that we must be content with the information contained in their annual reports.

Mr. REED of Pennsylvania. I agree with the Senator that the Senate is entitled to a direct response. I agree, if the Senate had remained in session, that to have deferred an answer until the filing of the annual report would not have been a courtesy to the Senate; in fact, it would have been a discourtesy.

Of course, so far as the Secretary's reply to the Senator's letter is concerned, I am sure that the delay is explained by the absence of Secretary Davis in South America. I have never known him to be guilty of discourtesy in failing to reply to any Senator's inquiry or in any other respect. If the Senator wants to have the Senate receive a direct reply to the resolution, I would not dream of opposing his request.

Mr. ASHURST. Let us compromise the matter in this way: I withdraw my motion and I will send to the Secretary of Labor a marked copy of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD containing to-day's proceedings and await such action as he deems proper.

Mr. REED of Pennsylvania. I am quite sure if the Senator does that he will have a prompt and courteous answer within a very few days.

PROPOSED INVESTIGATION OF PORTO RICAN AFFAIRS

Mr. BROOKHART. Mr. President, on Saturday I introduced a resolution to investigate some matters in reference to the government of Porto Rico. I have here some material prepared by the president of the American Federation of Labor, which I desire to have printed as a Senate document in support of that resolution.

Mr. WILLIS. Mr. President, I may not have any objection ultimately to the printing of the material as a document. I take it, however, that the Senator has not had an opportunity to examine these papers himself.

Mr. BROOKHART. Not personally.

Mr. WILLIS. And the Senator does not ever that in his opinion the matter ought to be printed as a document. I suggest, if it be agreeable to the Senator, that he permit it to be referred to the committee with his resolution. I assure him that the committee will give it consideration, and if it is thought desirable we can have it printed afterwards as a document.

Mr. BROOKHART. Very well; that is agreeable.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. JONES of Washington in the chair). Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Iowa that the matter be referred to the Committee on Territories and Insular Possessions? Without objection, it is so ordered.

WITHDRAWAL OF WATERS FROM LAKE MICHIGAN

Mr. McCORMICK. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD the decision of the Supreme Court in the case of the Sanitary District of Chicago against the United States.

There being no objection, the decision was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Supreme Court of the United States

(No. 161.—October term, 1924)

The Sanitary District of Chicago, appellant, v. the United States of America. Appeal from the District Court of the United States for the Northern District of Illinois

Mr. Justice Holmes delivered the opinion of the court.

This is a bill in equity brought by the United States to enjoin the Sanitary District of Chicago, a corporation of Illinois, from diverting water from Lake Michigan in excess of 250,000 cubic feet per minute;

the withdrawal of that amount having been authorized by the Secretary of War. It is alleged that the withdrawal of more, viz, from 400,000 to 600,000 cubic feet per minute, has lowered and will lower the level of the waters of Lake Michigan, Lake Huron, Lake St. Clair, Lake Erie, Lake Ontario, Sault Ste. Marie, St. Marys River, St. Clair River, Detroit River, Niagara River, St. Lawrence River, and all the harbors, etc., connected therewith, all of which are alleged to be navigable waters of the United States, and will thus create an obstruction to the navigable capacity of said waters; and that it will alter and modify the condition and capacity of the above named and their ports, etc., connected with them. The prohibition of such alterations and obstructions in the act of March 3, 1899, chapter 425, section 10; 30 Statutes, 1121, 1151, is set out at length and relied upon, but the frame of the bill does not exclude a reliance upon more general principles if they were needed in order to maintain it.

The withdrawal practiced and threatened is through an artificial channel that takes the place of the Chicago River, formerly a little stream flowing into Lake Michigan, and of a part of its branches. The channel instead of adding water to the lake has been given an opposite incline, takes its water from the lake, flows into the Des Plaines River, which empties into the Illinois River, which in its turn empties into the Mississippi. The channel is at least 25 feet deep and at least 162 feet wide, and while its interest to the defendant is primarily as a means to dispose of the sewage of Chicago, *Missouri v. Illinois*, 200 U. S. 496, it has been an object of attention to the United States as opening water communication between the Great Lakes and the Mississippi and the Gulf.

The answer shows that the defendant is proceeding under a State act of May 29, 1889, by which it was provided that a channel should be made of size sufficient to take care of the sewage and drainage of Chicago as the increase of population might require, with a capacity to maintain an ultimate flow of not less than 600,000 cubic feet of water per minute and a continuous flow of not less than 20,000 cubic feet for each 100,000 of the population within the sanitary district. It denies that the defendant has abstracted from 400,000 to 600,000 feet per minute, but as it alleges the great evils that would ensue if the flow were limited to the amount fixed by the Secretary of War or to any amount materially less than that required by the State act of May 29, 1889, and as it admits present conditions to be good, the denial can not be taken very seriously. The act sufficiently indicates what the State threatens and intends to do unless stopped. The answer also denies that the abstraction of water substantially in excess of 250,000 cubic feet per minute will lower the levels of the lakes and rivers concerned or create an obstruction to the navigable capacity of those waters. It goes into the details of the construction of the channel, the expenses incurred, and the importance of it to the health of the inhabitants of Chicago, both for the removal of their sewage and avoiding the infection of their source of drinking water in Lake Michigan, which had been a serious evil before. It shows the value of the channel for the great scheme of navigation that we have mentioned; recites acts of Congress and of officers of the United States alleged to authorize what has been done and to estop the United States from its present course, and finally takes the bull by the horns and denies the right of the United States to determine the amount of water that should flow through the channel or the manner of the flow.

This brief summary of the pleadings is enough to show the gravity and importance of the case. It concerns the expenditure of great sums and the welfare of millions of men. But cost and importance, while they add to the solemnity of our duty, do not increase the difficulty of decision except as they induce argument upon matters that with less mighty interests no one would venture to dispute. The law is clear, and when it is known the material facts are few.

This is not a controversy between equals. The United States is asserting its sovereign power to regulate commerce and to control the navigable waters within its jurisdiction. It has a standing in this suit not only to remove obstruction to interstate and foreign commerce, the main ground, which we will deal with last, but also to carry out treaty obligations to a foreign power bordering upon some of the Lakes concerned, and, it may be, also on the footing of an ultimate sovereign interest in the Lakes. The Attorney General, by virtue of his office, may bring this proceeding and no statute is necessary to authorize the suit. *United States v. Lacinto Tin Co.*, 125 U. S. 273. With regard to the second ground, the treaty of January 11, 1909, with Great Britain expressly provides against uses "affecting the natural level or flow of boundary waters" without the authority of the United States or the Dominion of Canada within their respective jurisdictions and the approval of the International Joint Commission agreed upon therein. As to its ultimate interest in the Lakes, the reasons seem to be stronger than those that have established a similar standing for a State, as the interests of the Nation are more important than those of any State. (*Re Debs*, 158 U. S. 564, 584, 585, 599; *Georgia v. Tennessee Copper Co.*, 206 U. S. 230; *Hudson County Water Co. v. McCarter*, 209 U. S. 349, 355; *Marshall Dental Manufacturing Co. v. Iowa*, 226 U. S. 460, 462.)

The main ground is the authority of the United States to remove

obstructions to interstate and foreign commerce. There is no question that this power is superior to that of the State to provide for the welfare or necessities of their inhabitants. In matters where the States may act the action of Congress overrides what they have done. (*Monongahela Bridge Co. v. United States*, 216 U. S. 177; *Second Employers' Liability Cases*, 223 U. S. 1, 53.) But in matters where the national importance is imminent and direct, even where Congress has been silent, the States may not act at all. (*Kansas City Southern Ry. Co. v. Kaw Valley Drainage District*, 233 U. S. 75, 79.) Evidence is sufficient, if evidence is necessary, to show that a withdrawal of water on the scale directed by the statute of Illinois threatens and will affect the level of the Lakes, and that is a matter which can not be done without the consent of the United States, even were there no international covenant in the case.

But the defendant says that the United States has given its assent to all that has been done and that it is estopped to take the position that it now takes. A State can not estop itself by grant or contract from the exercise of the police power. (*Texas & New Orleans R. R. Co. v. Miller*, 221 U. S. 408, 414; *Atlantic Coast Line R. R. Co. v. Goldsboro*, 232 U. S. 548, 558; *Denver & Rio Grande R. R. Co. v. Denver*, 250 U. S. 241, 244.) It would seem a strong thing to say that the United States is subject to narrower restrictions in matters of national and international concern. At least it is true that no such result would be reached if a strict construction of the Government's act would avoid it. This statement was made and illustrated in a case where it was held that an order of the Secretary of War under the act of March 3, 1899, chapter 453, the same act in question here, directing an alteration in a bridge must be obeyed, and obeyed without compensation, although the bridge had been built in strict accord with an act of Congress declaring that if so built it should be a lawful structure. (*Louisville Bridge Co. v. United States*, 242 U. S. 409, 417; *Greenleaf Johnson Lumber Co. v. Garrison*, 237 U. S. 251.) It only remains to consider what the United States has done. And it will be as well to bear in mind when considering it that this suit is not for the purpose of doing away with the channel, which the United States, we have no doubt, would be most unwilling to see closed, but solely for the purpose of limiting the amount of water to be taken through it from Lake Michigan.

The defendant in the first place refers to two acts of Congress—one of March 30, 1822 (3 Stat. 659), which became ineffectual because its conditions were not complied with, and another of March 2, 1827 (ch. 51, 4 Stat. 234)—referred to, whether hastily or not, in *Missouri v. Illinois* (200 U. S. 496, 526) as an act in pursuance of which Illinois brought Chicago into the Mississippi watershed. The act granted land to Illinois in aid of a canal to be opened by the State for the purpose of uniting the waters of the Illinois River with those of Lake Michigan, but if it has any bearing on the present case it certainly vested no irrevocable discretion in the State with regard to the amount of water to be withdrawn from the lake. It said nothing on that subject. We repeat that we assume that the United States desires to see the canal maintained and therefore pass by as immaterial all evidence of its having fostered the work. Even if it had approved the very size and shape of the channel by act of Congress it would not have compromised its right to control the amount of water to be drawn from Lake Michigan. It seems that a less amount than now passes through the canal would suffice for the connection which the United States has wished to establish and maintain.

In an appropriation act of March 3, 1899 (ch. 425, sec. 10, 30 Stats. 1121, 1151), Congress provided:

"That the creation of any obstruction not affirmatively authorized by Congress to the navigable capacity of any of the waters of the United States is hereby prohibited; * * * and it shall not be lawful to excavate or fill, or in any manner to alter or modify the course, location, condition, or capacity of any port, roadstead, haven, harbor, canal, lake, harbor of refuge, or inclosure within the limits of any breakwater or of the channel of any navigable water of the United States, unless the work has been recommended by the Chief of Engineers and authorized by the Secretary of War prior to beginning the same."

By section 12 violation of the law is made a misdemeanor and punished, and the removal of prohibited structures may be enforced by injunction of the proper court of the United States in a suit under the direction of the Attorney General. This statute repeatedly has been held to be constitutional in respect of the power given to the Secretary of War. (*Louisville Bridge Co. v. United States*, 242 U. S. 409, 424.) It is a broad expression of policy in unmistakable terms, advancing upon an earlier act of September 19, 1890 (ch. 907, sec. 10, 26 Stats. 426, 454), which forbade obstruction to navigable capacity "not authorized by law," and which had been held satisfied with regard to a boom across a river by authority from a State. (*United States v. Bellingham Bay Boom Co.*, 176 U. S. 211.) There is neither reason nor opportunity for a construction that would not cover the present case. As now applied it concerns a change in the condition of the Lakes and the Chicago River, admitted to be navigable, and if that be necessary, an obstruction to their navigable capacity

(United States v. Rio Grande Dam & Irrigation Co., 174 U. S. 690), without regard to remote questions of policy. It is applied prospectively to the water henceforth to be withdrawn. This withdrawal is prohibited by Congress, except so far as it may be authorized by the Secretary of War.

After this statute was passed the Secretary of War granted various permits, which are relied on by the appellant, although in their nature they all were revocable licenses. On May 8, 1899, the Secretary, on application of the appellant, granted permission to open the channel, assumed in the recitals to have a flowage capacity of 300,000 cubic feet per minute with a velocity of $1\frac{1}{4}$ miles an hour, on the conditions that the permit should be subject to the action of Congress—which was superfluous except as a warning—that if at any time the current created proved to be unreasonably obstructive to navigation or injurious to property he reserved the right to close or modify the discharge, and that the sanitary district must assume all responsibility for damages to property and navigation interests by reason of the introduction of a current in Chicago River. On July 11, 1900, improvements of the Chicago River were permitted, with the statement that the permission did not affect the right of the Secretary to revoke the permit of May 8, 1899. On April 9, 1901, the Secretary, Mr. Root, directed the sanitary district to cut down the discharge to 200,000 cubic feet per minute. On July 23, 1901, at the appellant's request, he amended the order to permit a flow of 300,000 feet between 4 p. m. and 12 midnight, subject to revocation. On December 5, 1901, again on the application of the appellant, leave was given to discharge not exceeding 250,000 feet per minute during the whole 24 hours, but subject to such modification as the Secretary might think that the public interests required. On January 17, 1903, the allowance was increased to 350,000 feet until March 31, 1903, after which date it was to be reduced again to 250,000 feet, all subject to modification as before. On September 11, 1907, and on June 30, 1910, permissions were granted to make another connection with Lake Michigan and to open a channel through Calumet River—this last refused by Mr. Secretary Taft on March 14, 1907—on the understanding that the total quantity of water withdrawn from the lake should not exceed that already authorized by the Secretary of War. Finally, on February 5, 1912, the appellant, setting forth that the population of the sanitary district exceeded 2,500,000 and was increasing rapidly, and that the only method then available for disposing of the sewage of this population was by diluting it with water flowing from Lake Michigan through the canal, asked permission to withdraw not exceeding 10,000 cubic feet per second, subject to such restrictions and supervision as might seem proper to the Secretary and to revocation by him. On January 8, 1913, Mr. Secretary Stimson carefully reviewed the situation, including the obvious fact that so large a withdrawal would lower the levels of the Lakes and the overwhelming evidence that it would affect navigation, and held that he was not warranted in excepting the appellant from the prohibition of Congress on the ground of even pressing sanitary needs. It appears to us that the attempt to found a defense upon the foregoing licenses is too futile to need reply.

States bordering on the Mississippi allowed to file briefs as amici curiae suggest that they were not heard and that rights have not been represented before the Secretary of War. The city of Chicago makes a similar complaint and argues that it is threatened with the loss of a hundred million dollars. The interest that the river States have in increasing the artificial flow from Lake Michigan is not a right, but merely a consideration that they may address to Congress, if they see fit, to induce a modification of the law that now forbids that increase unless approved as prescribed. The investment of property in the canal and the accompanying works took the risk that Congress might render it valueless by the exercise of paramount powers. It took the risk without even taking the precaution of making it as sure as possible what Congress might do. But we repeat that the Secretary by his action took no rights of any kind. He simply refused an application of the sanitary board to remove a prohibition that Congress imposed. It is doubtful at least whether the Secretary was authorized to consider the remote interests of the Mississippi States or the sanitary needs of Chicago. All interests seem in fact to have been copiously represented, but he certainly was not bound to give them a hearing upon the application upon which he was requested to pass.

After the refusal, in January, 1913, to allow an increase of flow, the appellant was notified by direction of the War Department that it was drawing more water than was allowed and was violating section 10 of the act of March 3, 1899. In reply it intimated that it was bound by the State law to which we have referred, and in obedience to it had been flowing 20,000 cubic feet per minute for each 100,000 of population and could not reduce that flow. It suggested that its rights should be determined by a suit, and accordingly this bill was filed on October 6, 1913. An earlier suit had been brought on March 23, 1908, to prevent the construction of a second channel from Lake Michigan through the Calumet River to the appellant's main channel, leave to do which had been refused, as we have seen, by Mr. Secretary Taft. (The permit subsequently granted on June 30, 1910, was with the understanding that it should not affect or be used in the "friendly suit" then

pending to determine rights.) The earlier suit was consolidated with the later present one, and it was agreed that the evidence taken in that should be used in this, so far as applicable. There was some delay in concluding the case, which the defendant naturally would desire, but after it was submitted to the judge, according to his own statement, he kept it about six years before delivering an oral opinion in favor of the Government on June 19, 1920. No valid excuse was offered for the delay. There was a motion for reconsideration, but the judge took no further action of any kind until he resigned in 1922. On June 18, 1923, another judge entered a decree for an injunction, as prayed, with a stay of six months, to enable the defendant to present the record to this court.

The parties have come to this court for the law, and we have no doubt that as the law stands the injunction prayed for must be granted. As we have indicated, a large part of the evidence is irrelevant and immaterial to the issues that we have to decide. Probably the dangers to which the city of Chicago will be subjected if the decree is carried out are exaggerated, but in any event we are not at liberty to consider them here as against the edict of a paramount power. The decree for an injunction as prayed is affirmed, to go into effect in 60 days, without prejudice to any permit that may be issued by the Secretary of War according to law.

INTERIOR DEPARTMENT APPROPRIATIONS

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President, I desire to submit a request for unanimous consent.

I ask unanimous consent that at the conclusion of the business of the Senate to-morrow afternoon, and not later than 5 o'clock, the Senate shall take a recess until 8 o'clock, and that the evening session shall be devoted to the consideration of House bill 10020, the Interior Department appropriation bill, only.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the unanimous-consent agreement proposed by the Senator from Kansas? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. MOSES. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator will state the inquiry.

Mr. MOSES. I wish to know if routine morning business on Monday includes the call of the calendar?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. It does not.

Mr. MOSES. In spite of the fact that it is provided that the calendar must be called?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair is attempting to carry out and enforce the unanimous-consent agreement with regard to the Muscle Shoals bill and has held that in case of adjournment the routine morning business may be considered, but nothing further.

Mr. MOSES. But that, may I suggest, was not on a Monday. On Monday the calendar must be called, must it not? I am suggesting that the routine morning business on a Monday includes the call of the calendar under Rule VIII.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair ruled differently on last Monday.

Mr. MOSES. And the Chair rules in the same way on this Monday?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair will rule again if it becomes necessary.

Mr. MOSES. And in the same manner?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Unless otherwise convinced.

Mr. MOSES. Mr. President, I am myself firmly convinced that the Chair is in error, but in view of the circumstances I shall take no appeal.

Mr. ROBINSON. Mr. President, with respect to the last observation by the distinguished Senator from New Hampshire, I do not think the criticism of the Chair's ruling should go unchallenged, because the ruling of the Chair is manifestly correct according to the view of the matter that I take.

Rule VIII provides that—

At the conclusion of the morning business for each day, unless upon motion the Senate shall at any time otherwise order, the Senate will proceed to the consideration of the Calendar of Bills and Resolutions, and continue such consideration until 2 o'clock.

The answer to the proposition of the Senator from New Hampshire is that the Senate has otherwise ordered.

Mr. MOSES. Mr. President, I was quite willing to accept the ruling of the Chair in spite of the reinforcement of the Senator from Arkansas.

LEASES OF NAVAL OIL LANDS

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The routine morning business is closed.

Mr. WALSH of Montana. Mr. President, is not one of the orders of routine morning business resolutions coming over from a preceding day?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair has held that resolutions coming over from a previous day are not included in routine morning business.

Mr. WALSH of Montana. Mr. President, I desire simply to make an announcement concerning a resolution. I refer to the resolution or motion submitted by myself to adopt the report of the Committee on Public Lands and Surveys touching the leasing of the naval oil reserves. This, it will be recalled, was the subject of some protracted discussion during the closing hours of the last session, but it was found impossible to dispose of it. It was my purpose to ask immediate consideration of it upon the assembling of Congress, but the Senator from Missouri [Mr. SPENCER] asked me if I would not kindly allow it to go over for a few days, until he had an opportunity to prepare a minority report. I yielded to his request, and intended then to call it up to-day, and so announced to him; but he came to me a few days ago and said that he was obliged to leave the city on account of the illness of his wife, and asked me to allow it to stand over until his return, a matter of 10 days. It will be recalled that when the matter was under consideration at the last session the Senator was earnestly pleading for further time to consider the report. When we reconvened he was asking for further time to prepare a minority report, and now a request is made for further time. Under the circumstances, however, I do not find it possible to refuse the request of the Senator; but I now give notice that two weeks from to-day I shall ask that the Senate shall proceed to the consideration of that motion.

Now, Mr. President, if the Senate will indulge me for a few minutes, I should like to take this opportunity to notice some animadversions that were made in the course of the proceedings of the Senate a few days ago emanating from this side of the Chamber, touching the investigations that were conducted during the last session of Congress, including this inquiry into the leasing of the naval oil reserves. The strictures that were made at that time were directed mainly to the manner of the conduct of these investigations and the motives that actuated those who were conspicuous in their prosecution, rather than to the character and the value of the disclosures that were made.

Perhaps wiser selection might have been made of a Senator to discharge the duty that fell to me in that connection. The duty might have been intrusted to some one who could bring to the task more consummate skill and art; but that is a matter of no great consequence, as I view it, if the disclosures were as wide and as important as might be expected from the more accomplished searcher after truth. I engage in no controversy with any one upon that score; neither do I offer a defense of or any encomium on the part taken by my colleague [Mr. WHEELER]. He has demonstrated his full ability to take care of himself, and may be depended to do so on his return; but he might very wisely ignore any criticisms of his methods until some one shall arise to question the value of his services in driving from the Cabinet a member notoriously unfit for the place, the last chapter in whose official record, not yet written, bids very fair to justify my colleague's course.

But, Mr. President, I am particularly concerned in that part of the remarks of the Senator to the effect that those investigations were entered upon and prosecuted solely from political motives and for partisan ends, and, accordingly, that the country did not take them seriously, if, indeed, there was not a recoil that proved damaging, and perhaps disastrous.

If the Senator at any time had any sympathy whatever with the investigations, he very successfully concealed it in his remarks; and the rebuke which he administered was directed not only against my colleague and myself but against the entire body of Democratic Senators for countenancing the investigations, or lending in any manner their support to the action of the Senate taken with reference to them.

It is, to say the least, a little remarkable that a Senator who signalized his appearance among us by voting for the Republican candidate for chairman of one of the important committees of the Senate should have constituted himself the mentor of his associates upon this side of the Chamber and the censor of their acts and their motives. But, Mr. President, if we assume that the Senator is absolutely right about the matter, that all those concerned in any manner in the prosecution of these investigations were moved only by political motives, and that they were prosecuted for political profit and for partisan advantage—

Mr. BRUCE. Mr. President, may I interrupt the Senator? Has he really read my observations in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD?

Mr. WALSH of Montana. I have the remarks of the Senator before me.

Mr. BRUCE. I never made any such statement.

Mr. WALSH of Montana. I speak advisedly about the matter.

Mr. BRUCE. I never said that those investigations were organized simply for partisan purposes.

Mr. WALSH of Montana. I read from the remarks of the Senator:

I am betraying no secret when I say now—though no human power could have induced me to breathe the words before—that after Mr. Davis had been campaigning for weeks during the last presidential contest he said to me on one occasion, "Senator BRUCE, I can not see that there is the slightest reaction in the United States anywhere to the oil scandals." I replied, "But suppose that those investigations had been just a little freer from partisan extravagance than they were?"

Mr. BRUCE. Mr. President—

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Montana yield to the Senator from Maryland?

Mr. WALSH of Montana. I do.

Mr. BRUCE. Are those the words that the Senator is putting in my mouth?

Mr. WALSH of Montana. I had not quite completed the reading.

Mr. BRUCE. Yes; but I wanted to comment just a little as the Senator went along, with the permission of the Senator.

Mr. WALSH of Montana. No, no; I shall object to that.

Mr. BRUCE. The Senator very naturally would object.

Mr. WALSH of Montana. No, no; not naturally at all. I want to read what I referred to:

"Suppose that the members of those investigating committees had in some instances been just a little more carefully selected than they were, and suppose that those investigations had been conducted in a more impartial, judicial spirit; might not the result then have been different? Might not some real effect on public opinion have been worked?" In my humble opinion these questions can be answered only in the affirmative.

Mr. BRUCE. Mr. President, may I interrupt the Senator again?

Mr. WALSH of Montana. I yield to the Senator.

Mr. BRUCE. Are those the words that the Senator from Montana places in my mouth?

Mr. WALSH of Montana. I just extract these, which fully justify everything that I said; but they are only illustrative of the entire speech of the Senator.

Mr. BRUCE. I am sure the Senator will find no Member of the Senate, after he has read those observations, who shares that opinion.

Mr. WALSH of Montana. As to that, we shall see. But, Mr. President, I proceed. Let us assume that the Senator is correct, that these investigations were entered upon and prosecuted for no purpose whatever except for political profit and partisan gain—what difference does it make? Is Fall's delinquency any the less grave than if my motives were as white as the driven snow? Is Doheny's alleged loan any the less reprehensible? Are Sinclair's transactions any the less tortuous or suspicious? Are they all absolved because I am not without fault in the way that I conducted this investigation?

It will be remembered that the apologists for these gentlemen endeavored to minimize their misdeeds, or at least to divert public attention from them, by exploiting some possible obloquy that they might find in me or in my colleague [Mr. WHEELER]. They find now in the Senator a valued ally. I pass the personal criticism in this matter, and I direct attention to the criticism so freely uttered against all of his colleagues upon this side of the Senate. Suppose they were, indeed, actuated by these rather low motives assigned to them by the Senator. This country of ours is run on the party system. That system has its virtues and it has its vices, and one of the conspicuous merits of that system is that the minority or opposition party is always on the alert to show up the mistakes and weaknesses of the opposing party, and particularly to discover and reveal any deficiencies or corruption that may exist in any public officials for whom the opposing party is in any wise responsible, and in that way it is believed—and not without reason that is confirmed by experience—that a higher standard of public service is assured. The Democratic Party would have been false to itself and false to the country if it had not improved the opportunity which came to it in this connection.

I desire to correct another mistaken impression which might very easily be gained from the remarks of the Senator, namely, that there existed here during the last session of Congress

something in the nature of an alliance or an understanding between the Democratic Members of both Houses—at least of the Senate—and certain insurgent Republicans, so called, more or less closely associated with the senior Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. LA FOLLETTE]. The result of the last election had hardly been announced when press notices issued from the city of Washington telling that that alliance was to be dissolved at the insistence of certain conservative or so-called "old line" Democrats. I deny that any such alliance or understanding ever existed, and I venture the assertion that the reports to which I have referred emanated from Republican sources, and are referable to the Republican National Committee, the idea now being disseminated by the Senator from Maryland.

What are the facts about the matter? When the Congress reassembled a year ago, the Republican caucus, in accordance with custom, made nominations for chairmen of various committees of the Senate, respectively. The Democratic caucus did likewise. There being no opposition on the Republican side to any of the nominations so made, except as to that for chairman of the Committee on Interstate Commerce, all of the Republican nominees, with the exception of the senior Senator from Iowa [Mr. CUMMINS], named for that place, were elected by a strict party vote. In the contest which ensued with respect to the chairmanship of the Committee on Interstate Commerce, the Democrats, including the Senator from Maryland, voted solidly in favor of the nominee of the Democratic caucus, the senior Senator from South Carolina [Mr. SMITH], the ranking minority member of the committee. The dissident Republicans—

Mr. BRUCE. Mr. President, may I interrupt the Senator?

Mr. WALSH of Montana. Certainly.

Mr. BRUCE. Does the Senator mean to say that I ever united at any time in the selection of the Senator from South Carolina, in or outside of a caucus, as chairman of the Committee on Interstate Commerce?

Mr. WALSH of Montana. That was my recollection. I spoke from recollection.

Mr. BRUCE. Then the Senator's memory is as wrong in this instance as it was in the former.

Mr. ASHURST. Mr. President, the Senator from Maryland voted for Mr. SMITH, the senior Senator from South Carolina.

Mr. BRUCE. For Senator SMITH, of South Carolina?

Mr. ASHURST. I entered it in my journal that the Senator so voted; and if he will look at the roll call, he will see his vote recorded.

Mr. BRUCE. In the first instance; not as the result of any caucus action.

Mr. WALSH of Montana. I have not said that the Senator voted as the result of any caucus action.

Mr. BRUCE. The Senator said in the caucus.

Mr. WALSH of Montana. I beg the Senator's pardon; I have not spoken about the caucus at all except to say that the caucus made certain nominations. I am speaking about the votes in the Senate. The entire body of Democratic Senators voted for the Senator from South Carolina, including, according to my recollection, the Senator from Maryland. Then the dissident Republicans offered to their associates various candidates, who were unacceptable. They tried a number of other candidates from their own side of the aisle, none of whom were accepted. Then in the course of the balloting enough Republicans came over and voted for the Senator from South Carolina to accomplish his election; but that was frustrated by the Senator from Maryland going to the Senator from Iowa [Mr. CUMMINS]. But later on enough more Republicans came over to elect the Senator from South Carolina, without any concession whatever from him, without any agreement or any understanding or any compact of any character whatever.

So with the revenue bill when it came before the Senate. Substitute schedules were offered by the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. SIMMONS], the ranking minority member of the Committee on Finance. They were voted for solidly, my recollection is, upon the Democratic side, and enough Republicans came over to incorporate those substitute schedules in the bill. These votes are simply illustrative. The situation was just exactly the same with reference to the votes in connection with the investigations. There never was any agreement or anything in the nature of an alliance between the Democrats and anybody on the Republican side.

The Democratic Party, as represented in the Senate during the last session of Congress, held its own course. It accepted votes, as a matter of course, in favor of the measures it supported, no matter where they came from, and I venture to say, if I may be permitted to speak for it, that it will continue to pursue that course. It will not shy away from any measure, I

dare say, or from any ideal, because it happens to be favored by the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. LA FOLLETTE] or by any other Republican Senator, and I make bold to say that it will not follow in the way pointed out either by the votes or the remarks of the Senator from Maryland.

Mr. President, to my mind the hope, and the only hope, of the liberal thought of the country is in the Democratic Party. I think the last election must have demonstrated to the enlightened and to the perverse alike that it is futile to look any other way for relief from the evils which seem to be inseparable from continued Republican supremacy. If the result of that election was to any degree disheartening or disappointing or regrettable, the causes must be looked for elsewhere than in any action or failure to act on the part of the Democratic Members of either House of Congress during the last session.

Mr. BRUCE. Mr. President—

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair desires to say to the Senator from Maryland that there is nothing before the Senate, and until we take one step further debate will not be in order.

Routine morning business is closed, and in accordance with the unanimous-consent agreement entered into on the 17th of December, 1924, the Chair now lays before the Senate the bill (S. 1898) reclassifying the salaries of the postmasters and employees of the Postal Service and readjusting their salaries and compensation on an equitable basis, with the message of the President returning the bill with his objections to the measure. The pending question is on the appeal taken from the ruling of the Chair. In order to refresh the memories of Senators, I may say that the ruling was that the limitation which by unanimous consent had been put upon the debate relating to the amendment offered by the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. SMITH] to House bill 518 did not apply to this bill. The yeas and nays were ordered, and the question is, Shall the decision of the Chair stand as the judgment of the Senate?

Mr. McKELLAR. The purpose having been accomplished, as I recall, I ask unanimous consent to withdraw the appeal.

Mr. BRUCE. Mr. President—

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Tennessee asks unanimous consent to withdraw the appeal from the ruling of the Chair. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and the appeal is withdrawn and the order for the yeas and nays canceled.

The question now is upon the motion made by the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. STERLING] to refer the bill and message to the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads.

Mr. HARRISON. Mr. President—

Mr. BRUCE. Mr. President, I had addressed the Chair.

Mr. HARRISON. I do not want to interfere with the speech of the Senator, but I gave notice of a motion to amend the motion of the Senator from South Dakota.

Mr. BRUCE. I do not intend to make a speech. I want to make just a few brief observations.

Mr. HARRISON. I will temporarily withhold calling up my motion to amend.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Maryland is recognized.

Mr. BRUCE. Mr. President, I have not the slightest intention of making any extended observations in reply to the remarks of the Senator from Montana [Mr. WALSH]. He said nothing that he did not have the right to say, so far as the temper and spirit of what he said is concerned, and I find myself to-day involved in quite a different situation from that in which I found myself involved a few days ago. I admit that, but I am just a little curious to know how far this process that seems to have been set up in some quarter or other of baiting me as a member of the Democratic Party is to go. I find myself now almost in a position calculated to remind me of the words of Shakespeare:

The little dogs and all,

Tray, Blanch, and Sweetheart, see, they bark at me.

But, as I have said, I am not going to reply to the Senator from Montana in any acrimonious spirit, because apart from falling into several doubtless inadvertent statements of what I said he uttered little at which I can justly take umbrage. But I must say that it does seem to me a little hard that the Senator should imagine that anything that I said a few days ago bore harshly upon him personally, when if he had turned to what I said in the course of the investigations that went on at the last session of the Senate he would have found that I was one of the Democratic Members of this body who paid a

warm, cordial tribute to the ability and energy with which he played his part in those investigations.

I have the sincerest respect for the Senator from Montana. He is one of the ablest Members of this body, one of the very ablest, and he will look in vain in my remarks of a few days ago for any statement that I at any time have ever thought that any reproach should attach to him for lack of fairness in the conduct of his part of those Senatorial investigations. On the contrary I think that he bore himself like a true lawyer in the conduct of those investigations so far as he had anything to do with them. He is perfectly right when he intimates that a legislative investigation is no "kid glove" or "rose water" affair; though those are not his words, but mine. With the tenor of what he said in that connection I entirely agree, but I affirm that nothing could be more unjust, though I know there was no rancorous resentment behind the statement when he made it, than the accusation—I hate to use that word—of the Senator that I was not in sympathy with those legislative investigations. Go over the whole record of my connection with them, and it will be found that my vote was invariably cast under any and all circumstances for their prosecution.

Why, has the Senator from Montana forgotten that after, when they had gone on for some time and the President sent a special message to this body protesting against their continuance, I rose to my feet, and whilst speaking of the President in the deferential language in which every Senator should speak of the President, I declared that I for one did not know how to set any limit to a legislative investigation into official misconduct. I have been too long connected with legislative bodies not to know that one of the highest functions that they can perform is the critical, the inquisitorial function, the function which makes of a legislative body a sort of grand inquest, charged with the solemn duty of unearthing rascality and bringing to condign justice official misconduct in every form.

Though I had the highest respect for the Secretary of the Treasury, I also took occasion in commenting upon the message of the President to assert that I thought that he, too, had fallen into an error of judgment when he seconded the course which the President was pursuing. I went so far as to remind him that the Emperor Joseph, of Austria, had said that it was needless to talk to him of assassination, for assassination was but a part of the trade of a king; and to add that he, too, should realize that the higher the place a man in public life occupies, the more exposed he is to the shafts of calumny and misrepresentation.

So I repel, I will not say with scorn, but I repel with emphasis, with indignation, the allegation, no matter by whom it may be made in this body, that at any time I ever sustained the relation of an obstructive to any of those investigations. But I think that there is a measure of fairness that should be consulted even by a prosecuting attorney when he is prosecuting the most squalid and criminal wretch that ever stood in a criminal dock. Nobody felt more strongly than I did that Fall was a scamp. I never doubted that fact for a moment. Nobody was more thoroughly impressed than I was with the squalid, to say the least, conditions with which Attorney General Daugherty had surrounded himself while he was in office. But I believe in the good old principle that no man should be found guilty even by a legislative committee until he has been adjudged to be guilty, and, moreover, should not be found to be guilty until he has been prosecuted, in a more or less fair-minded, impartial, and judicial spirit. The Senator from Montana, with his capacity as a lawyer, with his caliber in every respect, could perform his part of those investigations without any grave breach of proper principles of procedure, but there were others who in my judgment did not.

So I do not hesitate to say again that in my opinion the effect of those investigations, aside from the connection of the Senator from Montana with them, upon public opinion in the United States would have been absolutely different if they had been conducted in a different manner by some of the members of the investigating committees.

Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts. Mr. President—

Mr. BRUCE. I hope that the Senator will not interrupt me.

Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts. May I ask the Senator to exclude also the investigation of the Veterans' Bureau?

Mr. BRUCE. I know nothing about the investigation of that bureau, except that it seems to me that it was conducted in the most praiseworthy manner in every respect.

Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts. The reason why I interrupted the Senator was that he was making a general statement exempting only the investigation conducted by the Senator from Montana, and I requested that he include in the

exemption the conduct of the investigation of the Veterans' Bureau.

Mr. BRUCE. I did not have that in mind at all. I was speaking only of the group of investigations that arose out of the flagrant misconduct of Fall, and the equivocal, to say the least, conduct of Daugherty.

I have no criticism to make of the Senator from Montana. Of course, I have sometimes thought that he was too good a lawyer not to realize that there was no real constitutional foundation on which the resignation of Secretary Denby could be requested by the Senate, but I am willing to admit that doubtless he honestly found some line of forensic reasoning that satisfied any scruples that he may have entertained upon that subject.

So much for that, and I hope that, at least, the Senator from Montana will not take too much to heart the feeling that has been engendered by the discussion that took place between the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. HARRISON] and myself a few days ago, and for which I am so human as to think that I was in no wise responsible as the aggressor.

Just a word with reference to the selection of the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. SMITH] for the chairmanship of the Interstate Commerce Committee. I never voted for him in any caucus called by the Democratic Members of this body. So far as I know, no caucus was ever called, and to this day it has always been a mystery to me, though the fact, I have no doubt, could be readily explained, why the purpose of the Members of this body on our side of the Chamber to elect Senator SMITH was never communicated to me. I voted for Senator SMITH in the first instance because I thought I was voting for a Democrat supported exclusively by Democrats, but when on the very first day that I changed my vote from Senator SMITH to the Senator from Iowa [Mr. CUMMINS], the Senator from Montana [Mr. WHEELER] came to my office and told me that the progressives on the other side of the Chamber were going to bring to this side of the Chamber sufficient voting strength to elect the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. SMITH] I felt that it was time for me with my convictions, public and party, to recede from the support—

Mr. ROBINSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. BRUCE. Just a moment, and I will yield with pleasure—to recede from the support that I had given to Senator SMITH and to transfer it to the Senator from Iowa [Mr. CUMMINS]. That is the history of that matter.

The junior Senator from Montana [Mr. WHEELER] came to my office, as he had a perfect right to do, talked over the situation with me, gave me the information to which I have referred, and left with the statement from me that his views about public matters were very different in many respects from mine, and that if it was the purpose of the Democratic side of the Senate to enter into any combination with progressives on the Republican side of the Senate for the purpose of electing a chairman of the Interstate Commerce Committee I should have to part company with my colleagues.

Mr. ROBINSON. Mr. President, will the Senator from Maryland yield to me?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. JONES of Washington in the chair). Does the Senator from Maryland yield to the Senator from Arkansas?

Mr. BRUCE. I will.

Mr. ROBINSON. The Senator from Maryland, of course, knows that the rules of the Senate provide for and require the election of chairmen of the committees by the Senate? The Senator, of course, knows that?

Mr. BRUCE. Yes; I think that is true.

Mr. ROBINSON. But does not the Senator know it to be true?

Mr. BRUCE. That is my recollection.

Mr. ROBINSON. If the Senator has not that degree of familiarity with the rules of the Senate that he can concede beyond question that the rules of the Senate require the election of the chairmen of Senate committees by the Senate, I do not know that I can pursue further the questions I have in mind.

Mr. BRUCE. Very few individuals can arrogate to themselves omniscience.

Mr. ROBINSON. Mr. President, I do not understand that it is arrogating omniscience to anyone to say that after having been a Member of this body for a number of years he knows that the rules of the Senate provide for the election by the Senate of members of committees and of committee chairmen.

Mr. BRUCE. I have been here only one session, if the Senator will recollect,

Mr. ROBINSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to a further question?

Mr. BRUCE. Yes; if it is a little more timely than the one which the Senator from Arkansas has just asked.

Mr. ROBINSON. Did the Senator from Maryland prefer the nominee of the Democrats, the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. SMITH], when he voted for him, to the nominee of the Republicans, the Senator from Iowa [Mr. CUMMINS]?

Mr. BRUCE. Of course, under ordinary circumstances, I would prefer any Democratic candidate for any office or for any position to any Republican candidate or applicant.

Mr. ROBINSON. Why did the Senator object to the election of the candidate that he had theretofore been supporting?

Mr. BRUCE. Why? Because the fact came to my knowledge that he was not simply the candidate of the Democratic Party but was also the candidate of the party which, so far as it was represented in this Chamber, was represented by the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. LA FOLLETTE] and his adherents; and it was because of that that I said—

Mr. ROBINSON. The Senator knows that the Senator from South Carolina was not the candidate of the so-called progressive Republicans. The Senator knows that the occasion for the controversy over the election of a chairman of the Committee on Interstate Commerce grew out of the fact that the Republicans were not able to agree among themselves, one candidate or faction presenting the Senator from Iowa [Mr. CUMMINS] and the other presenting the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. LA FOLLETTE].

Mr. BRUCE. I know nothing about it except what was communicated to me by the junior Senator from Montana [Mr. WHEELER]; that the Progressives were to come to this side of the Chamber and unite with it in electing the Senator from South Carolina. That was enough for me, and it always would under any circumstances be enough for me. I at once announced to the whole country—as is still true—that there was no boat wide enough to hold the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. LA FOLLETTE] and me.

Mr. ROBINSON. Oh, yes. Then, the answer is that the Senator—

Mr. BRUCE. Now, I really think the Senator—

Mr. ROBINSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to a further question?

Mr. BRUCE. I do not think I can, because the interruptions of the Senator from Arkansas are merely cumulative.

Mr. ROBINSON. I think I ought to be permitted to ask a question.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Maryland declines to yield.

Mr. BRUCE. I do not like to say that, but when interruptions are merely repetitive—

Mr. ROBINSON. Am I correct then in my construction of the Senator's answer, when I say that he voted against the Democratic candidate for chairman, for whom he had been voting, because he learned that enough votes from the other side were to be cast for him to accomplish his election?

Mr. BRUCE. I did.

Mr. ROBINSON. The Senator, then, did not want to elect the Democratic candidate?

Mr. BRUCE. The Democrats were about to make the fatal mistake—and I think that it proved fatal—of striking hands with Senator LA FOLLETTE and his adherents, and I rejected that course.

Mr. ROBINSON. Mr. President, will the Senator from Maryland yield to a question?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Maryland yield further to the Senator from Arkansas?

Mr. BRUCE. Yes.

Mr. ROBINSON. The Senator from Maryland states that the election of the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. SMITH] as chairman of the Committee on Interstate Commerce proved to be a fatal mistake. Will the Senator tell us in what particular it has proved fatal or harmful, and tell us how it violated any Democratic principle for the Democrats on this side of the Chamber to support an old-line Democratic candidate rather than an old-line Republican candidate?

Mr. BRUCE. I have nothing to say derogatory about the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. SMITH]; my relations with him are very pleasant, and I have not the slightest disposition to disparage him in any way personally, and I never have had; but the first result—

Mr. ROBINSON. The Senator has charged—

Mr. BRUCE. I will answer the question of the Senator from Arkansas.

The first result of that pact was the passing of the Committee on Interstate Commerce entirely into the control of the radical element of this body.

Mr. ROBINSON. How did the committee pass under the control of the radical element of this body? The membership of the committee was not changed in any respect by the election of a Democratic chairman.

Mr. BRUCE. But the result was as I have stated.

Mr. ROBINSON. What action taken by the committee does the Senator from Maryland regard as having been fatal?

Mr. BRUCE. It is the first step, as the French say, that always costs.

Mr. ROBINSON. Is that the only answer the Senator can make to my question?

Mr. BRUCE. That one is good enough, in my judgment, for the purposes of the case.

Mr. ROBINSON. The Senator regards the election of a good Democrat as chairman of the committee when the Republicans could not agree upon any one, when they had two candidates and were unable to elect, as a fatal error, does he?

Mr. BRUCE. It left the impression upon the minds of the people of the country that the Democrats of this body were mere opportunists.

Mr. ROBINSON. Why mere opportunists if the Democrats of the Senate voted for a Democrat?

Mr. BRUCE. Because it seemed as if they were willing to form an alliance in any quarter that they could and with anybody that they could, and had abandoned the principles which they had always professed for principles that in my judgment are as foreign to the true principles of the party as the Arctic Circle is to the Antarctic.

Mr. ROBINSON. If the Senator will yield to a further question, how does it constitute an abandonment of principle for a Democrat to vote for a Democrat?

Mr. BRUCE. Well, now, I really think that I have gotten to the point where I might be at liberty to—

Mr. ROBINSON. Does not the Senator rather think that it was an abandonment of principle for a Democrat to vote for a Republican?

Mr. BRUCE. I have answered that repeatedly. I have, I was about to say, reached a point that reminds me of an observation of Doctor Johnson. Doctor Johnson was on one occasion conversing with somebody who kept saying, "I do not understand; I do not understand your reasons." "Well," replied Doctor Johnson, "I do not see that it is my duty to furnish you both with reasons and understanding." [Laughter.]

Mr. ROBINSON. The Senator, of course, assumes himself to be Doctor Johnson. That is a fine illustration of the Senator's frankness. If the Senator is satisfied with his answers to my questions, I am entirely satisfied to let the matter rest.

Mr. BRUCE. Well, I do not know that my answers are very good, but they are quite as good as the Senator's questions, so that we may call things even.

Mr. ROBINSON. The Senator has never yet explained to the Senate nor to the country why he voted for a Democrat as long as there was little chance of his election and then forsook him and voted for a Republican when he learned that enough votes might be secured to accomplish the election of his theretofore candidate.

Mr. BRUCE. I made the explanation at the time and I have made it since, and I do not propose to make it any more.

Mr. ROBINSON. Nobody but the deceased Doctor Johnson, perhaps, and the Senator from Maryland have ever understood any explanation the Senator from Maryland has made or can make concerning it.

Mr. BRUCE. Mr. President, I had almost concluded what I wished to say when the Senator interrupted me. I have narrated the history of the shifting of my vote from Senator SMITH to Senator CUMMINS, and all I have to say in conclusion is that I have never seen the slightest occasion for regretting the change.

Mr. ROBINSON. If the Senator will yield for one further question, he has said that his objection to voting for Senator SMITH at the time his election was consummated was that he learned the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. LA FOLLETTE] was going to vote for him. I ask if that is not a very good way for the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. LA FOLLETTE] to control the vote of the Senator from Maryland?

Mr. BRUCE. I did not say Senator LA FOLLETTE at all. Senator LA FOLLETTE represents a good deal more than himself. It is only fair and just to him to say that he represents a party. What I meant to say was that I learned that Senator LA FOLLETTE and his adherents on the Republican side of the Chamber proposed to unite with Democratic Senators—

Mr. ROBINSON. And that the Senator from Maryland did not propose to vote for anybody the Senator from Wisconsin and his adherents would vote for, even though he had been voting a number of times for the Democratic candidate.

Mr. BRUCE. It seems to me the Senator is merely indulging in the vain repetition that is said to vex the ear of a drowsy man, and I do not propose to make any further answer.

Mr. ROBINSON. If the Senator will pardon me—

Mr. BRUCE. I can not yield any longer.

Mr. ROBINSON. I think that is exactly what the Senator from Maryland is doing to everybody, not only to the drowsy man but to the man who is awake and wants to do something.

Mr. BRUCE. Well, sometimes a man is a little too awake and does a good many things that might just as well have been left undone, and that is what I think about this plan that was entered into to elect Senator SMITH as chairman of the Interstate Commerce Committee.

I want to say in conclusion that we really have reached a stage where there is no good purpose to be secured by any Democrat in pursuing these acrid topics. All Senators will bear me out when I say that, independent, in some respects, as my course at the last session in this body was, no one in the Senate ever heard me utter one single, solitary, censorious word about any action that my colleagues chose to take in connection with those investigations or any other object of party policy that the majority of Democrats in this Chamber saw fit to pursue. Is that not the fact, I ask the leader on this side of the Chamber, the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. ROBINSON].

Mr. ROBINSON. Is the Senator addressing his question to me?

Mr. BRUCE. I am.

Mr. ROBINSON. I was unfortunate enough to be out of the city when the Senator delivered his address to which the Senator from Montana has referred. I heard the language read by the Senator from Montana in the course of his remarks this morning, and I place upon the language the same construction as that placed upon it by the Senator from Montana. I think that the Senator from Maryland, if he admits that he made the speech quoted by the Senator from Montana, did criticize the investigations.

Mr. BRUCE. The Senator misunderstood me again. I was not referring to anything that has happened at this session of the Senate. As I have said, I have no disposition to keep the embers of old animosities alive, and I certainly have no desire to say anything to which the sensibilities of the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. HARRISON] could take exception. He and I had a little bout, and I think he could say in the language of the old Confederate soldier at Appomattox, that "he killed just as many of me as I killed of him," and I imagine that he has too generous a spirit to harbor any lasting resentment about any clash that may arise between him and another Member of the Senate.

What I was saying was that at the last session of this body no Senator on this side of the Senate ever heard me question at any time the personal motives of any Democratic Senator who differed from me, or ever heard me utter one single reproachful personality to one of my colleagues.

Mr. WALSH of Montana. Mr. President, I should like to say to the Senator that he will search my remarks in vain for any criticism of anything he did or anything he said at the last session of Congress. I rose to call attention to the remarks of the Senator a week ago; and I simply desire to inquire of the Senator now whether he desires to allow those remarks to stand?

Mr. BRUCE. Of course I do, because I conceive that I owe a higher obligation to the truth than I could ever owe to any party or any individual, and those are my conceptions of the truth; but so far as the Senator is concerned—

Mr. WALSH of Montana. The Senator will appreciate that his words include me just as well as the Senator from Massachusetts.

Mr. BRUCE. No; they do not. I referred to the selection of some of the members of the committees. The only mistake I make was in not excepting the Senator from Montana by name; that is all.

Mr. ROBINSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Maryland yield to the Senator from Arkansas?

Mr. BRUCE. Yes.

Mr. ROBINSON. The Senator asked me whether I heard him at the last session make personal criticism of his colleagues on this side of the Chamber. I will say that I did not; but, hearing his answers to the Senator from Montana, I want now to inquire whether his address the other day was intended

for some other of his colleagues than the Senator from Montana, who was excepted.

Mr. BRUCE. There is no use of going into that.

Mr. ROBINSON. Let me say that I do not think any very great good is to be accomplished by acrimonious debate or personal allusions—

Mr. BRUCE. No.

Mr. ROBINSON. And I myself have never indulged in them, and never intend to.

Mr. BRUCE. I am glad to hear that.

Mr. ROBINSON. The Senator from Maryland has asked me a personal question. Let me say, in reply to that, that from his whole course toward his colleagues on this side of the Chamber he will have to get his character as an amiable Democrat toward his colleagues from some other source.

Mr. BRUCE. Oh, I will get it when you all unite again on the right sort of platform.

Mr. ROBINSON. The Senator is criticising the platform. May I ask the Senator what provisions of the Democratic platform he wants to eliminate, now that the campaign is over and the election accomplished? The Senator, it seems, now addresses his objection to the Democratic platform.

Mr. BRUCE. The time will come when all that passing error, as I saw it, will sink into the infinite past. As I discern it, the old current of thought and feeling that was taking us nowhere is already being reversed; and as I witness the reversal of that current—and it is setting in strongly—I can not help thinking of the words used by one of the characters in Shakespeare's *Tempest*, when the shipwrecked seamen in it were coming back from their trance:

The approaching tide

Will shortly fill the reasonable shore

That now lies foul and muddy.

Let us have no more acrimony.

Mr. ROBINSON. May I suggest to the Senator from Maryland that he is the man who began it, and that I agree with him that it ought to be terminated immediately. So far as I am concerned, I have neither done nor said anything that by any possibility of construction could be construed as an invitation to the performance, which must be very gratifying to our friends on the other side of the Chamber, and which I have not the slightest doubt they have stimulated.

Mr. BRUCE. No; that is not—

Mr. ROBINSON. The Senator is like an old woman; he wants the last word; and so far as I am concerned, he can have it. [Laughter on the floor and in the galleries.]

Mr. BRUCE. Well, have you not noticed that the old women always have it?

Mr. ROBINSON. Yes; and I notice that the Senator is getting it.

Mr. BRUCE. Well, I will tell you: I do not mind so much—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will suspend just a moment. Under the rules of the Senate, demonstrations of approval or disapproval are not allowed in the galleries; and the Chair desires to admonish the occupants of the galleries and advise them of that rule.

Mr. BRUCE. The Senator from Arkansas is entitled to his laugh. That is all right. All I want to say to him is that I do not mind so much being called an old woman, because—

Mr. ROBINSON. Mr. President—

Mr. BRUCE. One minute.

Mr. ROBINSON. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Maryland yield to the Senator from Arkansas?

Mr. BRUCE. One minute. I do not yield.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator declines to yield.

Mr. BRUCE. I do not yield.

Mr. ROBINSON. It would be unparliamentary to call the Senator an old woman, however much he resembled one. It was not unparliamentary to say that he was like an old woman.

Mr. BRUCE. I do not yield.

Mr. ROBINSON. I thought the Senator yielded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Arkansas will refrain from interrupting. The Senator declines to yield.

Mr. BRUCE. I feel like recalling a remark that I recalled last winter to the Senator. We had once a very distinguished Democrat in Baltimore who had a most wonderful gift for preserving his good humor when he was interrupted in the course of his speeches. On one occasion an Irishman named Larry Finnegan kept on interrupting him, just exactly as the Senator from Arkansas is now interrupting me. This was Governor Whyte to whom I refer. Finally the governor turned to him and said, "Be aisy, Larry; and if you can't be aisy, be as aisy as you can."

The Senator says I am an old woman.

Mr. ROBINSON. O, Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BRUCE. Now be easy, be easy.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Maryland yield to the Senator from Arkansas? [A pause.] The Senator declines to yield.

Mr. BRUCE. I want to say that that reflection does not wound me very sensibly, because—

Mr. ROBINSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Maryland yield to the Senator from Arkansas?

Mr. ROBINSON. The Senator has misquoted me.

Mr. BRUCE. Now, Senator—

Mr. ROBINSON. Will not the Senator yield? He certainly does not want to misquote me.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Maryland yield to the Senator from Arkansas? [A pause.] The Senator declines to yield.

Mr. ROBINSON. Does the Senator decline to yield after I state to him that he has misquoted me?

Mr. BRUCE. I think that I understood what the Senator said.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator declines to yield.

Mr. BRUCE. I say, I do not mind so much being put in the class of old women, because I recollect that my friend Benjamin Franklin said on one occasion, in one of his famous productions, that all old women are good women.

Mr. ASHURST. All the old men are good men.

Mr. BRUCE. By no means. The worst thing in this world is a vicious, abandoned old man, though there are some middle-aged men that are almost as pestiferous.

Mr. ROBINSON. Why does the Senator look in this direction when he makes a remark like that?

Mr. BRUCE. They are usually from the State of Arkansas.

Now, Senators, I really must conclude. All I want to say is that I have nothing except the warmest and most cordial feelings of regard for every single one of my fellow Democrats in this Chamber—for you, for you, for you, for you, for you, for you, for you—and I hope that the time will come, if it has not come already, when I can say that that feeling is heartily reciprocated.

RECLASSIFICATION OF POSTAL SALARIES—VETO MESSAGE

Mr. EDGE. Mr. President, I hesitate to interrupt in any way the family quarrel across the Chamber. I rather thought, however, that the people of the country had settled those questions in an emphatic manner to the tune of some 7,000,000 votes last November; but apparently the quarrel continues on the floor of the Senate.

Under the unanimous-consent agreement we have only two days in which to consider the veto message of the President of the United States expressing his disapproval of the so-called postal salary increase bill. Likewise, under the unanimous-consent agreement, we are compelled to dispose to-day of a motion which is pending, that the message and bill be referred to the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads.

Mr. HARRISON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for just a question in that connection?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from New Jersey yield to the Senator from Mississippi?

Mr. EDGE. I will yield for a question.

Mr. HARRISON. I merely want to state that I have an amendment pending, instructing the committee to report back the bill immediately with the recommendation that it pass; so I hope, if the Senator is in favor of my amendment, that he will say something about it.

Mr. EDGE. Mr. President, the pending motion was made by the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. STELLING], as I recall. The amendment of the Senator from Mississippi I do not recall, but that is a matter of detail that can be discussed when the Secretary states the amendment.

As I said, the Senate must dispose to-day of the pending motion. I had not intended to discuss the motion itself particularly, although I oppose it, but it was my intention, rather, to confine my remarks to the veto message itself, the reasons assigned by the President of the United States for his disapproval of the bill, and to endeavor to present to the Senate in some detail why I feel that the bill should be passed, the veto notwithstanding.

So far as the pending motion to commit is concerned, I will express my views on that in a very few sentences. It can have but one effect, and that is to postpone, if not entirely prevent, the consideration of the veto message.

I have already on several occasions expressed the view that postal revenues could and should be increased. I lis-

tened, however, with a great deal of attention to the explanation of the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. Moses] on Saturday in reporting the bill which the subcommittee had prepared for the specific purpose of increasing the postal revenue, and to me it was absolutely apparent and obvious that such a bill could not pass at this session of the Senate. Practically every detail of the bill, every suggested increase in revenue, was the subject of attack, was the subject of a distinct difference of opinion. It was admitted time after time by the proponent of the measure, the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. Moses], that he was not at all confident the figures submitted by the Post Office Department were sufficiently accurate to base an opinion as to the justification of increases to the revenue-producing system. In other words, it was plainly apparent to any Senator in the Chamber on Saturday that a bill to increase the postal revenue, as has already happened in the committee, where public hearings were held for several days, would develop great opposition, with very good arguments, very forceful arguments as to why the Government should encourage to some extent, through nominal postal rates, the dissemination of literature, newspapers, magazines, and other printed material. The proposal which, as we all know, goes back for perhaps 20 years, and has been considered from time to time by the Congress of the United States, has to date apparently gotten nowhere. We might as well face the facts, and should face the facts. The object of the motion to commit the veto message to the committee, with the bill, is, apparently, in order to see if it will be possible to pass the Moses bill now pending before Congress.

Let me say that it is with great regret that I find myself in a position differing with the President's viewpoint on this matter; but I do differ, and it seems to me the four or five main reasons that have been presented by the President in his veto message can be very readily explained and justify the passage of the bill. I shall attempt to analyze them in the brief time that I have.

The President's veto, as I have indicated, is based on five objections—first, economy; second, the failure to provide additional revenue in order to meet the \$68,000,000 necessary, as estimated, to pay the increased salaries; third, the failure to differentiate between living costs in large cities and in rural communities by establishing a rate of wage different in large cities than in rural communities; fourth, some reference to the prevailing wage scale in other departments and other industries of a similar character; and, fifth, the relationship of the present wages to the present cost of living. I believe those are the five major objections presented by the veto.

The objection based on economy would generally appeal to all of us, but in my judgment economy must be classified, in its consideration, just the same in public business as in private business. There is a type of economy that is well understood to be false economy that has been recognized time after time in private business enterprise, and corrected after that recognition. In my judgment it is false economy to have an army of 300,000 more or less dissatisfied workers. It is a type of economy that would not contribute, if continued, to the best results in that great and important department of the Government.

Looking over this problem from the standpoint of economy, I was very much impressed with the Budget estimate presented to the Congress shortly after it convened last December. That Budget estimate points with pride, commendable pride, to the statement of the finances of the country at the present time. Reading, now, from the Budget report as it appears in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, it was estimated that the surplus of receipts over expenditures for the fiscal year 1924 would amount to the tidy sum of over \$329,000,000, and that for the fiscal year 1925 it would be increased to a sum in the neighborhood of \$395,000,000, an increase of some sixty million and odd dollars in the past year. It was also estimated that the income in excess of the estimates of the department, the estimates upon which we base our expenditures, was some \$175,000,000 more than the Bureau of the Budget had anticipated.

With that showing it does not seem to me the country is facing bankruptcy at this particular moment. It does not seem to me that it will be entirely unjust and an evidence of a failure to recognize economy if the Government of the United States should raise the salaries of letter carriers, who now, upon entering the service, get approximately \$27 a week, to a salary somewhere near that of hod carriers, who at the present moment get \$36 a week. It does not seem to me that this great country of ours will suffer in the matter of economy if we bring the standard of salaries of the 300,000 men and women carrying our mails, in all types of weather, in every

section of the country, somewhere near a parallel with the salaries paid workers in other industries which are parallel.

The newspapers of the country have generally, almost universally, I may say, commended this raise in postal salaries. That has not been true of other Government expenditures. Apparently those who insist that the revenues be increased are also in entire sympathy with the vetoed salary bill now pending, because, as we know, this bill was added intact to the revenue bill introduced by the Senator from New Hampshire. I understand through the public prints that the President is likewise now favorable to the salary measure with the revenue feature attached.

I am not going to take the time of the Senate to read lengthy editorials referring to the measure, but one appearing in the Chicago Tribune quite recently appealed to me as being so logical and as setting forth in such a short space the story that I am going to read it for the benefit of those Senators who are following this discussion. It is as follows:

RAISE THE PAY FOR POSTAL WORKERS

Low pay and good Postal Service can not stick together much longer. Twenty thousand postal workers resigned last year.

That is some explanation of the necessity for a revision in salaries. The editorial continues:

That is a high turnover for civil-service jobs.

If the Senate overrides the President's veto of last June on the postal salary increase bill, it will be better for the mail service, fairer to the workers, and the President probably will not care much.

Under present pay scales a postal clerk or carrier must work from four and a half to eight years before he can get a maximum salary of \$1,800 a year. It costs \$1,000 to train a new man. If 20,000 postal workers every year decide that a maximum of \$1,800 is not worth staying for, that means a cost of something like \$20,000,000 in training new men to take their places. That cost alone, distributed as a pay increase to the entire force of 300,000 men, would add \$66 to their salaries.

An average increase of \$300 is required by the bill, and that is none too much. It will be saved in mail efficiencies and in industrial justice. Men with families and steady on the job will find \$2,100 a year about the minimum limit for American living. And the mails should be handled by responsible men with families and steady on the job.

Mr. WILLIS. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from New Jersey yield to the Senator from Ohio?

Mr. EDGE. I yield.

Mr. WILLIS. Will the Senator state from what publication he is reading now?

Mr. EDGE. I am reading from the Chicago Daily Tribune.

Mr. WILLIS. Does the Senator know what the attitude of that journal is touching the bill providing means for raising revenue to meet these expenditures?

Mr. EDGE. I do not know. As I have indicated, I could read from other newspapers—the New York Sun, the New York World, and others—similar editorials; but I will not take the time of the Senate to do so.

Further discussing the question of the advisability or necessity of raising revenues to meet this particular expenditure, which is perhaps the paramount question, it appeals to me that such insistence is not well taken. The history of salary raises in the Postal Service in this country, of which there have been five in the last 20 years, as I recall it, has demonstrated that the increase necessary to pay the additional salaries has been absorbed by the natural increase in business year by year in each case in from one to about three years.

In 1921 there was a deficit estimated by the Post Office Department, as found in the reports I have on my desk, of \$157,500,000. That was the year following a substantial raise in postal salaries. That deficit has been successively reduced—in 1922 to \$60,000,000; in 1923 to \$24,000,000; in 1924 to \$14,000,000—as evidenced by the report of the Postmaster General, which I have on my desk at this time, delivered to the Senate within the last 30 days.

Mr. WILLIS. Mr. President, I know the Senator desires to be exact. Is he not in error when he states that the deficit for 1923 was \$24,000,000? I understood him so to state. I have before me the report, which shows that the deficit for that year was \$39,805,702.

Mr. EDGE. When I have the opportunity, after completing my general discussion, I will be very glad to insert directly from the Postmaster General's report the authority for the figures I have given. Every one of them has been obtained from the records.

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from New Jersey yield to the Senator from Georgia?

Mr. EDGE. I yield.

Mr. GEORGE. If the Senator from New Jersey will permit me, I will say that I have before me a statement of the figures on the deficits from 1919 down to this time, as given by the Post Office Department in the hearing before the subcommittee during the holidays. I would like to put them in the RECORD in the Senator's speech, right at this point, because they bear out what the Senator is saying.

Mr. EDGE. I thank the Senator. I will be very glad to have them inserted in the RECORD as a part of my remarks.

Mr. GEORGE. In 1919 the deficit was \$33,950,000; in 1920 it was \$39,000,000; in 1921 it was \$80,000,000; in 1922 it was \$68,000,000; in 1923 it was \$37,000,000; in 1924 it was \$24,000,000. In 1925—and I wish to call the Senator's attention to this—it is estimated that the deficit will amount to only \$10,000,000. Taking the figures from the Post Office Department for the year ending June 30, 1926, it is estimated by the present Postmaster General and the men in his department that there will be no deficit, but that there will be a surplus.

Mr. EDGE. Mr. President, if the Senator will permit, I am very glad to have that statement inserted as a part of my remarks. I will supplement it and explain to the Senator from Ohio what probably accounts for the discrepancy. The Senator from Ohio will find in each of the reports of the Postmaster General what might be termed two distinct estimates, one based on the figures I have read, in which it is shown by the report for the year ending June 30, 1924, that the cash deficiency in postal accounts was \$14,603,976.24. I estimated it at about \$14,000,000 in my statement. If he will go on he will find a further explanation, that this deficiency is subject to adjustment, since it is based on actual payments made during 1923, and includes payment for service rendered in previous fiscal years which should not be paid, and so forth. In other words, I will admit that it is with great difficulty that one can arrive at a real net deficit because of the various matters which seem to be necessary to a proper consideration, but in presenting these figures I have presented them all from the reports of the department and can only give that as proof of their accuracy.

I was discussing, when interrupted, the ease with which the department can absorb the salary increase. I think it has been demonstrated that there may be a possible surplus in the next year as indicated by the statement just read, and that it is quite apparent that raises of this character can, in due time, be absorbed without, so far as meeting these expenses may be concerned, necessarily raising postal rates.

Mr. FLETCHER. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from New Jersey yield to the Senator from Florida?

Mr. EDGE. I yield.

Mr. FLETCHER. Has the Senator's attention been called to the increase in salaries and the new positions created in the Post Office Department here in Washington, especially with reference to the offices of the Postmaster General, the First Assistant, Second Assistant, Third Assistant, and Fourth Assistant, where the increases have been sometimes 50 per cent in salaries and new positions created?

Mr. EDGE. Yes; and I was coming to that later. Effective July 1, 1924, there were numerous increases in the Post Office Department. I have a list here. I will insert it in the RECORD, if I may have consent to do so, and not take the time to read it. It includes raises for a great many of the head officers, including the Assistant Postmasters General and many others, reaching quite a sum in total. There was absolutely no question raised at that time, as far as I recall, as to the necessity of increasing the income in order to meet those additional expenses.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the request of the Senator from New Jersey is granted.

The table is as follows:

[From hearings, Post Office appropriation bill, 1925]

Reclassification of salaries, Post Office Department.—Statements showing, by offices in the District of Columbia, the salaries for the fiscal year 1924, compared with rates fixed in accordance with "the classification act for 1923" for the fiscal year 1925

(Partial list, only those receiving increase of \$500 or more)

Designation	Fiscal year 1924, total rate	Estimated salary rate, fiscal year 1925
OFFICE OF THE POSTMASTER GENERAL		
Special assistant to the Attorney General.....		\$6,000
Administrative assistant.....		6,000
Personnel officer or appointment clerk.....	\$2,240	3,000
Assistant to chief clerk.....	2,240	3,300

¹ New.

Reclassification of salaries, Post Office Department.—Statements showing, by offices in the District of Columbia, the salaries, etc.—Con.

Designation	Fiscal year 1924, total rate	Estimated salary rate fiscal year 1925
OFFICE OF THE POSTMASTER GENERAL—continued		
Confidential clerk to the Postmaster General ¹	\$2,240	
Chief inspector.....	4,000	\$5,200
Chief clerk to chief inspector.....	2,240	3,000
Purchasing agent.....	4,000	5,200
Chief clerk to purchasing agent.....	2,240	3,000
Solicitor.....	5,000	6,000
Assistant attorney.....	4,500	5,200
Law clerk.....	2,040	3,000
Administrative assistant to the First Assistant Postmaster General.....		\$3,000
Assistant chief clerk, First Assistant Postmaster General.....		\$3,000
Special assistant, division of post-office service.....		\$2,700
Clerk.....	2,140	2,700
Assistant mechanical engineer.....		\$3,000
OFFICE OF THE FIRST ASSISTANT POSTMASTER GENERAL		
First Assistant Postmaster General.....	5,000	7,500
Chief clerk, First Assistant Postmaster General.....	2,740	3,300
Superintendent, division of post-office service.....	4,000	5,200
Assistant superintendent, division of post-office service.....	3,000	3,800
Superintendent, division postmasters' appointments.....	3,000	3,800
Superintendent, division of post-office and garage quarters.....		\$3,800
Assistant superintendent, division of post-office and garage quarters.....		\$3,000
OFFICE OF THE SECOND ASSISTANT POSTMASTER GENERAL		
Second Assistant Postmaster General.....	5,000	7,500
Chief clerk, Second Assistant Postmaster General.....	2,740	3,300
Superintendent, division railway adjustments.....	3,000	3,800
Assistant superintendent, division railway adjustments.....	2,490	3,000
General superintendent, Division of Railway Mail Service.....	4,000	5,200
Chief clerk, Division of Railway Mail Service.....	2,240	3,000
OFFICE OF THE THIRD ASSISTANT POSTMASTER GENERAL		
Third Assistant Postmaster General.....	5,000	7,500
Chief clerk, Third Assistant Postmaster General.....	2,740	3,300
Superintendent, division of stamps.....	2,750	3,300
Superintendent, division of finance.....	2,490	3,000
Superintendent, division of classification.....	2,750	3,800
Superintendent, division of registered mails.....	2,740	3,300
Superintendent, division of money orders.....	2,750	3,800
OFFICE OF THE FOURTH ASSISTANT POSTMASTER GENERAL		
Fourth Assistant Postmaster General.....	5,000	7,500
Chief clerk, Fourth Assistant Postmaster General.....	2,740	3,300
Superintendent, division of rural mails.....	3,000	3,800
Superintendent of engineering.....		\$6,000
Assistant superintendent of engineering.....		\$3,800
Superintendent, division of equipment and supplies.....	3,000	3,800

¹ Dropped in lieu of administrative assistant.

² New.

Mr. EDGE. Another matter of great importance enters into the consideration of the policy of raising the revenue to meet the additional expenses involved. I have always attempted to make clear my position as a Member of this body, and I hope I have partially succeeded, as to believing and adhering to business principles. I remember my good friend from Ohio [Mr. WILLIS], when the bill was under discussion last June, raised the question if I did not believe that in effect every business should stand on its own bottom, and that the income should be sufficient to pay the expense of conducting the business. Generally speaking, I heartily agree with the suggestion and always have agreed with that conviction and policy. However, the service of the Post Office Department is quite a different proposition from the average private business, and always will be, and of necessity.

For instance, if Senators will turn to the report of the Postmaster General for the year ending June 30, 1924, they will find a paragraph devoted to free mailing privileges. In that paragraph it will be found that it is estimated that there were over 450,000,000 pieces of matter, weighing over 96,000,000 pounds, mailed free under the penalty privilege, the postage on which, at the ordinary rate, would amount to \$12,842,000. The average business would, of course, not give goods away for nothing. The laws of the United States provide, as we all well know, that the franking privilege applies for departmental and congressional mail, and that a great volume of mail matter, amounting to over 96,000,000 pounds annually, is carried by the mails entirely free, but costing the Government over \$12,000,000.

Again, we have a system in the country provided by statute—I am not criticizing it, but demonstrating how impossible it is to compare the business of the Post Office Department with the average commercial business in the country—known as the "free-in-county" mailings of second-class publications, which aggregated 67,000,000 pounds of matter carried during the year

as covered by the report just referred to. We have other free mailing privileges for institutions, none of which I am criticizing, but simply pointing out the absurdity to compare with a business enterprise where for all service rendered a regulated or proper amount would be paid, and if that were done the Post Office Department, with present income, not to consider the increased income which reports demonstrate year by year, would right now show a decided surplus or profit to the taxpayers of the United States.

The question of policy as to whether postal salaries should be increased unless postal revenues are increased presents another interesting thought. As a matter of fact we have not increased postal revenues for a number of years with the exception of a temporary increase during the war, when first-class postage was increased and immediately reduced at the close of the war. As a matter of fact the tendency has been to lower postal rates, as I indicated at the beginning of my remarks.

The conviction has apparently come about that the Postal Service of the United States to a great extent is one of those great helpful departments of the Government, as is the Agricultural Department or the Department of the Interior, which contributes to the benefit and to the upbuilding of the country, disseminating information, helping to build up communities, giving the people an opportunity to get more closely in touch with the news of the day and of the world. So, with that apparent conviction, we have always tried to keep rates down, and, in my judgment, properly so. As I said, the tendency has been to lower, not to try to increase rates unscientifically simply in order to meet a worthy and necessary increase in postal salaries.

A few years ago, before the war, we lowered the first-class postage rate from 3 cents to 2 cents an ounce. By the same argument presented that when we increase salaries we must increase revenues, then when we reduced the first-class postage from 3 cents to 2 cents, and of course decreased the revenues, we should have immediately decreased the salaries of the postal army of the United States. It is a poor principle that does not work both ways.

No, Mr. President, there is no real businesslike relation between the income of the Post Office Department and the salaries to be paid to the men and women who are working in that department. Fix the rates where they should be, but not necessitated by proper salary raises.

They are either entitled to an increase or they are not. If they are entitled to an increase, then it must come from some form of taxation, and it makes little difference to the public, after all is said and done, what the form of taxation may be. They pay it in the end. It all comes from them, whether as additional postage to send second-class matter, newspapers, and magazines through the mails, or whether it is some other form of taxation.

The question before us is whether \$27 a week, the present salary for a letter carrier, is proper in proportion to the \$36 a week paid to the hod carrier. I am not depreciating the importance of the hod carrier, but I do think in a service of the character of the Postal Service, inviting men and women who must necessarily have a fairly good education to meet the civil-service requirements, offering them absolutely no future excepting if they remain five years they will gradually raise from \$1,400, the minimum, to \$1,800, and there stop unless they can get into some special class or later become a supervisor or something of that character, the employees should have more consideration.

It is not comparable with any other type of business on earth. A man goes at a low salary into a business institution, a bank, or factory, and has a natural hope and expectation that if he applies himself he will gradually forge ahead and perhaps become the president of that organization some day. He has no such chance when he enters the Postal Service of the United States. We should pay them higher in comparison. We should not even try to compare them with the average salary of the bank clerk or some one else of that character. Speaking of that, I can show in a few words that they are not paid comparable with that type of employee.

Mr. McLEAN. Mr. President, may I ask the Senator how the wages provided in his bill compare with the wages paid to employees in other Government departments where the service is comparable?

Mr. EDGE. I can answer that to a certain extent. There was a letter printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a few days ago from the Post Office Department, addressed to the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. NORBECK]. I have not a copy of that letter before me, but in it an effort was made to demonstrate that in some branches of the public service the average pay from the first to the sixth class, if I recall the classifications

correctly, was lower in some departments as compared to the Post Office Department. I inquired about that, because it was an interesting situation, although I think it would be most difficult to fairly or justly compare some departments of the Government, with entirely inside work, to some classes of the Post Office Department. At the same time, waiving that objection, I have been informed, and I can only give the Senator my information, that in computing those averages in other departments, estimating the average from the first to the sixth classifications, which only included clerks whose salaries were in the neighborhood of \$1,800 to \$2,000 a year, the average would naturally be that much lower in proportion, while in the Post Office Department it includes clerks of all grades from first to and including supervisors, some of whom receive as high as \$4,200 a year. So that the natural average, setting a maximum of \$4,200 and down to a minimum of \$1,400, would, of course, be greater than from a similar minimum to a maximum of \$1,800 or \$2,000. I am simply transmitting the general information I have without the actual figures.

Continuing on the subject of the necessity to raise revenue in order that the bill may become a law, we are faced with facts and not theories. I do not believe there is a Senator who will attempt to prophesy that we can pass a bill this year raising revenues, even though we could prepare a scientific one, which the chairman of the committee himself could defend. Then we are faced with the situation, if that is the correct analysis, that the postal salaries will not be increased, certainly at this session of Congress. We have here a bill on which I regret being compelled to take a different position from that of the Chief Executive, whose economy record I heartily praise and indorse.

We are faced with the situation that unless this bill, which has now gone nine-tenths of its parliamentary journey, shall be passed over the veto the postal salaries will not be raised and can not be raised certainly until a future session of Congress.

Mr. STERLING. Mr. President, will the Senator from New Jersey permit a question?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from New Jersey yield to the Senator from South Dakota?

Mr. EDGE. I yield.

Mr. STERLING. Suppose the President's veto of the bill should be sustained, will the Senator from New Jersey then assist in having passed a bill that will increase the salaries just as they are proposed to be in the bill vetoed and at the same time produce the revenue?

Mr. EDGE. Most assuredly, Mr. President. I have stated that fact so many times that I am surprised at the question. I shall be glad to assist in any possible way to pass a bill to raise salaries, but I am trying to point out the facts; and facts are hard to refute.

Mr. SWANSON. Mr. President, will the Senator from New Jersey permit me to ask the Senator from South Dakota a question?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from New Jersey yield to the Senator from Virginia?

Mr. EDGE. I yield to the Senator from Virginia.

Mr. SWANSON. I listened to the inquiry submitted by the Senator from South Dakota, and I inferred that he was alluding to the bill which he introduced and which was reported by the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. MOSES].

Mr. STERLING. Mr. President, if the Senator from New Jersey will permit me—

Mr. EDGE. Yes; I yield to the Senator from South Dakota.

Mr. STERLING. I will state to the Senator from Virginia that I am not necessarily referring to the bill which he has in mind, and yet I will say that that bill is a good bill as it was first introduced and also as reported by the chairman of the subcommittee of the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads.

Mr. SWANSON. The bill provides for raising revenue in order to make up the deficit which would be occasioned by increasing postal salaries. Does the Senator from South Dakota think that a bill proposing to raise revenue can originate in the Senate?

Mr. STERLING. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from New Jersey yield further?

Mr. EDGE. I yield.

Mr. STERLING. My attention has been called to the proposition now advanced by the Senator from Virginia, and I have investigated it with some care. After having done so, I am satisfied that the bill is not a revenue bill within the meaning of the Constitution.

Mr. SWANSON. What, then, would the Senator from South Dakota call a revenue bill under the Constitution?

Mr. STERLING. I would call a bill which provides for taxation generally, for taxation for the general expenses of the Government, a revenue bill within the meaning of the term "revenue" as defined by the authorities. Mr. President, I do not think this is at all a revenue bill. It is true that if enacted it would raise some revenue by the adjustment of rates of postage, but such revenue would be merely incidental to the purposes of the bill and would not be the main purpose or object of the bill. In the course of this discussion I will refer to the authorities on the subject, I will say to the Senator from Virginia.

Mr. SWANSON. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from New Jersey yield further?

Mr. EDGE. My time is limited and I am afraid I can not yield much longer.

Mr. SWANSON. I understand the bill provides for a certain amount of money being collected and deposited in the Treasury.

Mr. STERLING. Yes.

Mr. SWANSON. Postal receipts, the same as internal revenue and customs duties, constitute revenue when collected by the Government, it seems to me.

Mr. EDGE. I shall have to refuse to yield further.

Mr. SWANSON. The bill of the Senator from South Dakota is a mere subterfuge in order to defeat the bill which the President has vetoed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Jersey declines further to yield.

Mr. EDGE. I am very sorry to have to refuse to yield further, but my time is limited.

The Senator from Connecticut [Mr. McLEAN] asked a few moments ago as to the comparative salaries, and I intended, so far as I was able with the data at hand, to give information, which I think would be very interesting, relative to the comparative salaries of Government employees and the salaries of those employed outside of the Government. The question has frequently been raised as to whether the postal employees were being paid as much as is received by similar employees outside of the Government. Postal clerks and letter carriers of the highest grade, after having served five years, receive 72 cents an hour, which is an average of \$34.61 per week. I find in the document before me a few comparisons with certain trades, which I will read. For instance, newspaper compositors receive \$1.01 an hour; newspaper stereotypers receive 92 cents an hour; metal labor—iron and steel industry—receives 73 cents an hour; clothing cutters receive \$55 a week in New York and in Chicago \$47 a week, as compared to \$34.61 received by postal clerks and carriers; metal trades, 84 cents an hour; longshoremen, 80 cents an hour; bakers, 92 cents an hour; hod carriers, 78 cents an hour—I have already referred to them—as compared to 72 cents an hour as the maximum, the final wage, which the letter carrier and postal clerk can ever receive.

Mr. President, the question is also raised in the veto message of the President as to the cost of living and also as to the increase which has already been made in postal salaries. It is true that postal salaries have been raised approximately 50 per cent, I think, in the last nine years, though I may be mistaken as to the exact time. I do not think any Senator in the Chamber will question that compared to the period previous to the war living costs have increased considerably more than 50 per cent. I think the average of such increase as given by the Labor Department has been in the neighborhood of 69 to 72 per cent. So if salaries of postal employees have been increased, as they have, from \$1,200 per annum, which was the maximum in 1912 or 1913, such increases have not kept pace with the increase of living costs.

I desire to say that I have received, I think, literally hundreds if not thousands of letters from postal workers, not in the form of propaganda prepared by any association or commercial body but from postal workers themselves. Among the number was one that particularly appealed to me, and I am going to put it into the RECORD as a sample of hundreds. This communication happens to come from North Dakota, where I think it is generally admitted that living expenses are much less in comparison than they are in some of the more populous sections of the country. The writer of the letter states:

I am inclosing an account of the manner in which I spent my salary for last year.

This letter is so practical, so matter of fact, and so direct that I thought it would appeal to Members of the Senate.

We have kept careful account of our expenses, and this is correct to a dollar. There may be some items here which a mail carrier should

not aspire to. For instance, the insurance on our lives; but I do not think it is unreasonable.

I went into the service in 1918, when it was next to impossible to get men at the price offered by the Government. I turned down an offer of \$1,000 per year and went into the post office at \$800 per year; and you know the course the salary has taken since then.

If you can use this to any advantage when our salary bill comes up on January 5, I will be glad to have been of some small service in a good cause.

If, as all, including the President, seem to agree, the proposed raise is merited, why should it not be given to us, and provision made as soon as possible thereafter for increasing the revenue to meet the extra expense?

You know, and the President knows, and we carriers know, that if the administration bill takes the place of the present bill it will not be passed at this session of Congress.

Retail prices, at least in this section of the country, are going up. The only item that I can think of that is cheaper than last year is coal. Good bituminous coal now sells for \$13 to \$15 per ton, about \$2 per ton cheaper than last year.

Suits for men that cost \$25 last year now cost \$30 to \$35; our uniforms are \$5 to \$10 higher.

Flour sells at \$4.85 to \$5 per hundred. Sugar, butter, eggs, meat, lard, and, in fact, almost anything you buy is 5 to 10 per cent higher than a year ago.

Hoping that your efforts in behalf of the postal employees of the country will be rewarded and assuring you of our appreciation of your efforts, I am,

Yours truly,

S. B. BARR,

City Carrier No. 2, Devils Lake, N. Dak.

I wanted to read particularly the tabulation inclosed by Mr. Barr, entitled "How I spent my salary for last year":

1. Rent, at \$35 per month—

That is not extravagant—

Making a total for the year of.....	\$420.00
2. Fuel (10 tons soft coal, at \$16.50 per ton).....	165.00
3. Grocers' bills for the year.....	298.37

Remember this is for a family of five.

4. Clothing for family of five, including one winter uniform, and one cap and trousers for summer wear.....

5. Life insurance as follows:	
\$2,000 on my own life.....	\$96.84
\$1,000 on my wife's life.....	31.60
\$3,000 on my son's life.....	77.24
\$1,000 on my daughter's life.....	23.58

6. To church, \$1 per week.....	52.00
7. Light, water, and phone.....	62.14
8. Doctor bills.....	50.00

They are very fortunate in having such small doctors' bills in North Dakota.

9. Helping son and daughter in college.....	\$200.00
10. Vacation trip for three of us.....	50.00

Total.....	1,877.96
Salary \$1,800, less 2½ per cent.....	1,755.00
Deficit.....	122.96

I presume that 2½ per cent is the amount deducted on account of the Federal retirement fund.

Above is for family of five. One son and one daughter in college, and one son in junior high school.

The son and daughter in college are earning most of their expenses. Which items shall I cut out this year?

S. B. BARR,

City Carrier No. 2.

Mr. President, that is a sample of hundreds of similar letters which I have received. The writer of that letter is receiving the maximum. If he remains in the service until he drops in his tracks, he will not receive more than \$1,800, unless legislation shall be passed increasing his compensation, although perhaps he might look forward to some kind of a pension in the case of his retirement. In my judgment, in the face of such an illustration as that contained in the letter, it is not just to attempt to keep postal salaries at the standard on which they are now fixed.

The question has likewise been raised as to the differentials between city and country districts. That I think was the fifth and last objection raised in the veto message. While it was conceded there should be some increases as I recall, it was conceded that they should be distinct as between the cities and the rural districts. Those Senators who heard the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. MOSES] discussing that problem on Saturday will realize how impossible it was for the committee to arrive at any differential. As a matter of fact, the problem

does not work out in the manner in which it might be supposed to work out. In a large city like Chicago, for instance, living costs are less than they are in the suburbs of that city, such as Englewood and many of the other suburbs which might be named; and yet under any possible device for a differential, which could only be fixed upon the basis of population or the receipts of the offices, and naturally the receipts of the offices of New York and Chicago would be in that class which, under any analysis, would give higher salaries to the carriers and clerks within the city limits, although the clerks and carriers in many of the suburban towns, living in the towns where they work, are paying to-day a higher cost of living than some of the postal employees who are living in the tenement houses in the hearts of the large cities. So the differential scheme does not work out; it can not be made practicable.

The unit system in all branches of the Government was referred to by the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. MOSES], who pointed out that a customs officer at some little point in Vermont or Maine, on the border line between Canada and the United States, receives exactly the same compensation as a customs inspector in the city of New York. The proposed increase is based to a great extent, of course, on the cost of living, just as all the expenses of the Government should be proportionate to that cost, but we can not differentiate in any automatic, hard-and-fast way and be at all fair to the large army of workers of this great branch of the public service.

Mr. President, it seems to me that I have demonstrated—I hope I have, at least—that the five objections which have been raised are not, in fact, objections which may not easily be overcome by careful consideration of the circumstances. As to the great objection of economy, I stand with the President at all times for that economy which contributes to the happiness and welfare of the people of this country, but I sincerely believe in this instance the economy which is proposed is a false economy. In view of the great surplus that this country has gathered, with our income in excess of our anticipated expenditures year after year, it seems to me that it is not necessary to grind down any of the employees of the Government or to necessarily pass a bill increasing the revenues, to which bill itself great objections are raised, in order to bring this army of 300,000 men and women into a condition which will be somewhat parallel to that of their fellow workers throughout the country. Do not let us be economical at such a cost. Let us be economical when it comes to some of the great experiments which are costing hundreds of millions of dollars to the taxpayers to-day. Livelihood is not an experiment.

We are spending, apparently cheerfully, forty or fifty million dollars a year as a deficit in maintaining a merchant marine. I do not complain of it, because I recognize the great value of a merchant marine. We are spending hundreds of millions of dollars to develop various sections of our country, or at least to encourage their development, through the improvement of rivers and streams and bays and harbors, and we do it cheerfully, because we believe it adds to the great progressive movements of our country, because it encourages initiative and development. With all those splendid tributes to the determination of our fellow citizens can we sit here for one moment and oppose increases of compensation to an army of men and women whose entire future is wrapped up alone in the Government of the United States? It is plainly evident that we are following precedent when we raise their salaries without revising revenues. Why such a crime now? We are only placing them somewhere near the compensation of comparable employment in other lines of industry; we are encouraging them to better service and protecting a service which has lost 20,000 men and women in one year, and we are encouraging what should be and is the fundamental of all business—a happy, contented, a well-developed, a 100 per cent Postal Service.

Mr. President, as much as many of my colleagues—and I am with them—regret to be compelled to vote to override a veto of the great President of the United States, I am sure the Senate of the United States will recognize that this is right, that this is just, that this must be done, and that it would be cowardice to put it off for another eight months.

Mr. WILLIS. Mr. President, when this matter was before the Senate last spring I made some brief observations upon the measure, and therefore shall not find it necessary to take very much time now. Since what I said was referred to by the Senator from New Jersey, however, I think it proper to refer to the RECORD to see just what was said.

On page 9592 of the RECORD for May 27 I said in part:

I myself went before the joint committee and made a statement in favor of an increase in postal salaries, but in every statement that I made and in every letter that I wrote I coupled this condition with

my request—that while, in my judgment, postal salaries ought to be increased, there ought to be at the same time such a readjustment of postal rates as would make the Post Office Department practically self-supporting. It was my understanding that such a bill would be reported by the committee, but on examining the pending bill I discover that not a single word is contained in it in reference to an increase in postal revenues; that nothing has been done toward the readjustment of postage rates.

And then subsequently, in the course of the discussion, I made it as clear as I could that, while I favored the increase of postal salaries, I utterly rejected the theory then put forth, and now put forth, by the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. EDGE] that there ought not to be any connection between income and expenditure.

Mr. President, to me it is an amazing theory to be advocated by a great Senator and a great business man—and the Senator from New Jersey is both of those—that in the conduct of such a business as is carried on by the Post Office Department we ought entirely to disregard the matter of relationship between income and expenditure. I understood the Senator's argument to be, in part, that because, according to the report of the Budget Commissioner, there was a surplus this year in the general fund of the Government of \$329,000,000 and next year there was estimated to be a surplus of \$395,000,000, therefore we ought to pass this bill without any reference to the income of the Post Office Department and dig into the general funds of the people to pay the approximately \$70,000,000 per annum increase which would be entailed by the enactment of this legislation.

Mr. President, there is a difference between the Post Office Department and other departments. It is said: "Why, we do not expect to get money returns for what we expend in the War Department, or perhaps not in the Interior Department." But, Mr. President, the Post Office Department carries on a different sort of work. It renders a direct service for certain people. It carries letters for some people and packages for other people. My contention is that so far as may be the people who use the post-office service ought to pay for the service, and it is the contention of the Senator from New Jersey that we ought not to pay any especial attention to that.

Mr. EDGE rose.

Mr. WILLIS. I withdraw that statement. I think I overstated the Senator's contention a little bit.

Mr. EDGE. I thank the Senator.

Mr. WILLIS. I will permit the Senator to state his own position, if he desires.

Mr. EDGE. No.

Mr. WILLIS. The Senator did not state it quite in that way, but he did state repeatedly that it was of no importance at all that there should be any connection between income and expenditure; and it is his belief, as I understand, that the deficit already existing—a deficit of approximately \$40,000,000 a year; \$39,800,000, according to the report that I have before me, and I will put all those figures in the RECORD, since they have been disputed—ought not to be considered in this connection.

Mr. EDGE. Will the Senator at the same time put in the \$14,000,000 in one year that has been referred to?

Mr. WILLIS. The Senator can put in anything he desires in his own speech, but he can not put it in my speech.

So that that matter may be cleared up definitely, Mr. President, at this point I ask unanimous consent to print in the RECORD the table that appears on page 11 of this document, Senate Document No. 162, "Cost of Handling Mail Matter."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Ohio? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

The matter referred to is as follows:

GROWTH OF THE POSTAL SERVICE—RECEIPTS AND EXPENDITURES FOR CERTAIN YEARS FROM 1800 TO 1923

The growth of the Postal Service has been phenomenal. A comparison of the receipts and expenditures for certain years from 1800 to 1923 shows the following:

Item	1800	1810	1820	1830
Receipts.....	\$280,804	\$551,684	\$1,111,927	\$1,850,583
Expenditures.....	213,994	495,969	1,160,926	1,932,708
Excess of receipts.....	66,810	55,715		
Excess of expenditures.....			48,999	82,125

Item	1840	1850	1860	1870
Receipts.....	\$4,543,522	\$5,499,984	\$8,518,067	\$19,772,221
Expenditures.....	4,718,236	5,212,953	19,170,610	23,998,837
Excess of receipts.....		287,031		
Excess of expenditures.....	174,714		10,652,543	4,226,616

Item	1880	1890	1900	1910
Receipts.....	\$33,315,479	\$60,882,098	\$102,354,579	\$224,128,657
Expenditures.....	36,542,804	66,259,548	107,740,267	229,977,234
Excess of expenditures.....	3,227,325	5,377,450	5,385,688	5,848,587

Item	1916	1917	1918	1919
Receipts.....	\$312,057,688	\$329,726,116	\$344,475,962	\$364,847,128
Expenditures.....	307,148,437	317,293,436	344,764,490	398,609,030
Excess of receipts.....	4,009,251	12,432,680		
Excess of expenditures.....			278,528	33,761,904

Item	1920	1921	1922	1923
Receipts.....	\$437,150,212	\$463,491,275	\$484,853,540	\$534,413,172
Expenditures.....	475,487,125	536,974,675	544,522,510	574,218,874
Excess of expenditures.....	38,336,913	73,483,400	59,668,970	39,805,702

¹ Exclusive of \$44,500,000, war-tax revenue accruing from increased postage rates.
² Exclusive of \$71,392,000, war-tax revenue accruing from increased postage rates.
³ Including estimated outstanding obligations.

Mr. WILLIS. Now, since I am referring to that, we will just check up on some of those figures.

This table, as it will be observed, shows receipts and expenditures in different years, first by 10-year periods. Going back as early as 1800, there was in that year a surplus of receipts of \$66,000. In 1810 there was a surplus of receipts of \$55,000. Then in 1820 it went the other way, and there was a surplus of expenditures of \$48,000, and so on down. In 1850 there was an excess of receipts of \$287,000, and in 1860 there was an excess of expenditures of \$10,652,000. But coming down to more recent times—all of the table will appear in the RECORD—in 1920 there was an excess of expenditures of \$38,000,000, in 1921 of \$73,000,000, in 1922 of \$59,000,000, and in 1923 of \$39,805,702; so it is approximately \$40,000,000. These enormous deficits indicate a growing tendency to disregard the sound economic policy which dominated when revenues and expenses were practically equal.

It is the contention of the Senator from New Jersey that instead of seeking first to care for the deficit that already exists—a deficit, as I have shown, of approximately \$40,000,000 per year—we should, without any reference to the income, add another deficit of approximately \$70,000,000 a year, making a total deficit in that department of \$110,000,000 per year; and yet upon that statement of facts the Senator avers that he is cordially in favor of the economy program of the President!

If the proposal is to take \$110,000,000 out of the surplus of \$329,000,000 that is indicated for the present year, if \$110,000,000 is to go to one department to make up the deficit there, what becomes of the tax-reduction program to which the Senator most eloquently has pledged himself? Of course, if we shall now abandon the theory heretofore held that the people who use the service shall pay for it, and adopt the theory now advanced that the Post Office Department shall be carried on out of the general revenues, it is perfectly apparent that there can be and will be no tax reduction. The added \$70,000,000 per year on the debit side will render practically impossible the tax-reduction program to which the President and Congress are pledged.

Since reference has been made to what the President said, it might be interesting right at this point to see just what he did say about this matter of economy. I have here a copy of the President's message. Let me read just two or three paragraphs.

On page 1 of the message he said, referring to Senate bill 1898:

This bill adds approximately \$68,000,000 to the annual expenditures of the Government. It makes no provision for raising this amount as

postal revenue. The money must come from the pockets of the taxpayers. To the extent that we create further obligations which must be met from the moneys derived from taxation, to that extent do we reduce the possibility of further reduction in taxes. Before such obligations are created it should be conclusively shown that they are essential in the best interests of the Nation.

The President further said:

It may be that some adjustments would be justified.

So far as I am concerned I would be willing to go further than that. I believe that there is justification for a general increase of postal salaries, and I have so stated repeatedly, publicly and privately, in the Senate and out of it; but the thing I can not understand is this: Why is it that Senators who say they are in favor of these increased salaries at the same time are opposed to the taking of any active measures for raising the revenue, but insist that it shall be put on the shoulders of the general taxpayers of the country?

The President goes on to say:

It may be that some adjustments would be justified, but an organized effort by a great body of public employees to secure an indiscriminate increase in compensation should have the most searching scrutiny. The needs of the public, the ability of the people to pay, must have some consideration.

Then, on page 3, the President says further, touching the financial side of the question:

Aside from this, no provision is made in this bill for raising the money which would be required to meet the additional expenditures which it proposes. Under its provisions we would be required to take an additional amount of approximately \$68,000,000 per year from the moneys paid by the taxpayers and pass it on to the employees of the Postal Service. Certainly the interests of the people demand that any legislation increasing the cost of the Postal Service should give consideration to the raising of the moneys necessary to defray the additional cost.

For the fiscal year 1923, the postal revenues were \$32,000,000 less than the cost of the service for that year.

So that is what the President actually says upon the question of finance, the question of economy; and, Mr. President, so far as I have yet heard or read, there has been no answer to that argument, and there will not be, and can not be; it is a simple, common sense, direct proposition that is incontrovertible. Here is a service that is rendered to the people. Then the people who use the service ought, in the long run, to pay for it, rather than the general taxpayer, who individually may not use that service to any great extent.

Mr. BROOKHART. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Ohio yield to the Senator from Iowa?

Mr. WILLIS. I yield to the Senator.

Mr. BROOKHART. Does the Senator claim that each taxpayer ought to pay for the service which is rendered in carrying his letters?

Mr. WILLIS. Oh, Mr. President, that is not practical, of course, except approximately. You can not get that.

Mr. BROOKHART. We hear that argument a lot, that we ought not to carry letters for some people at much less than the cost of the service and charge up the excess to some other people.

Mr. WILLIS. I quite understand the Senator's contention. Of course, they can reach only an approximation in such things.

Mr. BROOKHART. Take the carriage of franked mail or penalty mail. That all has to be paid for by general taxation.

Mr. WILLIS. I agree with the Senator on that point. If the Senator will permit me now, I ask unanimous consent at this point in my remarks to have printed the Table No. 80, found on page 189 of Senate Document No. 162. It relates entirely to cost ascertainment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Ohio?

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

TABLE 80.—Statement showing recapitulation of allocations and apportionment of revenues and expenditures for the fiscal year 1923, shown in Table A, according to the classes of mail matter and special services, and the loss or gain on each

Classes of mail matter and special services	Revenues	Expenditures	Loss	Gain
Paid first class.....	\$271,894,051.49	\$191,476,335.17		\$80,417,716.32
Second class.....	31,214,425.47	105,927,294.14	\$74,712,868.67	
Third class.....	43,844,940.77	60,136,516.25	16,291,575.48	
Fourth class.....	120,649,662.42	127,566,416.24	6,916,753.82	
Franked matter.....		357,819.45	357,819.45	

TABLE 80.—Statement showing recapitulation of allocations and apportionment of revenues and expenditures for the fiscal year 1923, shown in Table A, according to the classes of mail matter and special services, and the loss or gain on each—Continued

Classes of mail matter and special services	Revenues	Expenditures	Loss	Gain
Penalty matter.....		\$6,214,131.44	\$6,214,131.44	
Free for blind.....		27,315.29	27,315.29	
Foreign.....	\$12,871,746.39			
Receipts foreign mail transit.....	115,419.03	17,591,003.59	4,603,838.17	
Money Order.....	11,601,425.82	21,141,936.99	9,540,511.17	
Registry.....	8,005,579.20	18,379,593.01	10,374,013.81	
Postal Savings.....	5,409,504.00	708,092.95		\$4,701,411.05
Special Delivery.....	8,175,648.33	8,297,645.67	121,997.34	
Insurance.....	7,185,771.14	8,331,730.00	1,145,958.86	
C. O. D.....	4,079,143.35	5,904,580.74	1,825,437.39	
Treasury savings.....		221,809.28	221,809.28	
Total.....	525,047,317.41	572,282,220.81	132,354,030.77	85,119,127.37
Loss, excluding unassignable and unrelated items.....			47,234,903.40	
Less unassignable revenues.....	7,773,776.74		7,773,776.74	
Net loss, excluding unrelated.....			39,461,126.66	
Unrelated.....	1,592,077.63	1,936,653.15	344,575.52	
Grand total.....	534,413,171.78	574,218,873.96	39,805,702.18	

Mr. WILLIS. Now, answering the Senator's question, of course I recognize that an absolute allocation of cost is not possible, but when facts stare me in the face such as are brought out by this report—for example, that first-class matter now makes a profit of \$80,000,000 a year; that second-class matter is carried at a loss of \$74,000,000 a year; that third-class matter is carried at a loss of \$16,000,000 a year, and so on—when there are bold facts outstanding like that, I can not escape the conclusion that we ought at least to make some effort to approximate cost of service and to require those classes of mail matter which are creating the deficit to bear some of the burden, rather than to put it upon the general taxpayers.

Mr. BROOKHART. Are not those facts based upon somebody's opinion?

Mr. WILLIS. Undoubtedly; that always will be the case.

Mr. BROOKHART. Is there not quite a diversity of opinion as to that allocation?

Mr. WILLIS. Undoubtedly. Right on that point let me read something to the Senator that I wanted to use in the course of my remarks, and which I will take up right now. I think the question raised by the Senator is perfectly pertinent and proper. Of course, it is always bound to be a matter of opinion amongst the experts as to how these costs ought to be allocated. It is known, however, that this subject has been under inquiry and investigation for years. First, there was the report of the Hughes Commission, which went into the subject pretty thoroughly. All told, there have been spent something like \$500,000 in ascertaining these facts.

The Senator from Iowa has just raised a very proper question, as to the reliability of the findings of fact embodied in this report. The report was most carefully prepared, following an inquiry that extended over a number of years, including within its scope the report of the Hughes Commission. Following all that, this report was submitted to two firms of expert accountants, and at page 193 of Senate Document 162 I quote from what one of these firms—W. B. Dickenson & Co.—said relative to this report, so that the reliability of the statements of fact may be established, so far as possible:

It had been our intention to take up the points covered in the department's report step by step, but that report explains all the essential details and the reasons so clearly, that such a discussion on our part would be a repetition.

Note this:

It is our opinion that the principles involved are sound, that the work has been carefully and conscientiously done, and that the committee has achieved creditable results.

Subsequently this report was submitted to the firm of accountants known as Ernst & Ernst. I read fugitively from their report, just a paragraph or two, so that it may be clearly established that, so far as such a thing is possible, we have the facts now upon which to base our action. They say at page 198:

We examined the data acquired as a result of the tests made under the direction of the cost committee, and noted the evidences of fore-

sight and thought devoted to their development and application in the individual operations. They were in our opinion sufficient to reflect average conditions, and the committee, in our opinion, exercised good judgment in determining upon the extent of the tests, having regard for the variety of conditions and geographical distribution.

Mr. EDGE. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Ohio yield to the Senator from New Jersey?

Mr. WILLIS. I yield.

Mr. EDGE. Was the Senator in the Chamber Saturday when the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. Moses] in presenting his bill, based to some extent, I presume, upon that report, made the statement that while the report indicated that parcel post, fourth-class matter, had developed a deficit of something over \$6,000,000, it was his firm opinion that it was nearer \$20,000,000?

Mr. WILLIS. I think I heard the Senator make that statement.

Mr. EDGE. That was a statement made by the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. Moses].

Mr. WILLIS. Of course, Mr. President, I recognize that those must always be matters of estimate. The point I am now making is that we have before us a report that has been made after years of careful inquiry, and I am now undertaking to bring to the attention of the Senate what the expert accountants think of the methods that were pursued.

Ernst & Ernst further said:

A review of the revenues and expenditures over a period of several years and investigation and inquiries made by us in the course of our examinations in the field all serve to influence us in the opinion that the statistical period selected by the cost committee is fully justified, in that it reflects a normal or average condition in regard to the relation of the various classes of mail handled and special services rendered. The conclusion which we reached justifies the opinion that if the analysis work had been carried forward for an entire year the final results would not be changed to any appreciable extent.

Mr. NORRIS. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. McNary in the chair). Does the Senator from Ohio yield to the Senator from Nebraska?

Mr. WILLIS. I yield.

Mr. NORRIS. I want to get a right understanding, so as to give proper weight to this evidence and the opinion of these experts. By whom were they employed?

Mr. WILLIS. I could not answer the Senator's question from personal knowledge, but I understand they were employed by the commission. The Senator has the report. This is a letter to the Postmaster General from Ernst & Ernst. I really do not know by whom they were employed.

Mr. NORRIS. As I understand it, the cost ascertainment committee employed some experts, but those experts were not to examine into the matters under investigation. They examined the report of the committee. So that we would have a set of men doing some work, and employing some other fellows to look over their work, in order to get their opinion of their work; and paying them for that, I suppose. Of course, the experts said, "Why, it is fine work; good business."

Mr. WILLIS. As I understand the matter, these were men—

Mr. NORRIS. I am not trying to disparage the report. I only want to have the facts clear so as to know the weight to which the reports are entitled.

Mr. STERLING. Mr. President—

Mr. WILLIS. I yield.

Mr. STERLING. I think the Senator from Nebraska has an erroneous view.

Mr. NORRIS. I would like to be corrected. I am trying to get information.

Mr. STERLING. Experts were first suggested and employed, I think, at the instance of the joint commission on postal facilities, and they assisted not only in the way of looking over the reports prepared by the Post Office Department but they assisted in the preparation of the cost-ascertainment report. Then that report was subject to review by yet other experts who had not participated at all in the preparation of the report.

Mr. NORRIS. Who selected those experts?

Mr. STERLING. They were selected by the Post Office authorities themselves.

Mr. WILLIS. All I know about it is what appears in the document which the Senator has before him.

Mr. NORRIS. That is all I know about it, and I judge from what they say there that their work consisted mainly in looking over the report of the commission.

Mr. WILLIS. So far as these accountants were concerned, I think that is true, though I understand the department did have experts in its employ all the time in getting the facts.

Mr. STERLING. It did.

Mr. WILLIS. This is simply an estimate given by Ernst & Ernst.

Mr. STERLING. Ernst & Ernst were certified accountants employed by the Post Office Department for the purpose of examining the report.

Mr. WILLIS. I must say, without desiring to advertise Ernst & Ernst, if it would be an advertisement, that my knowledge of that concern would lead me to believe that they could not be induced at all, even if anyone tried to induce them, to make a false report.

Mr. NORRIS. Oh, no—

Mr. WILLIS. I do not mean that the Senator implied that.

Mr. NORRIS. I do not mean to disparage their work.

Mr. WILLIS. I understand that.

Mr. NORRIS. But, as a matter of fact, if they were employed by a committee and asked to examine their report, and were paid for their work, as, of course, they were entitled to be, that fact is something which ought to be taken into consideration in weighing the evidence.

Mr. WILLIS. I agree with the Senator that that is proper to be considered. Ernst & Ernst further say in their report, at page 199 of this document—just reading occasional paragraphs, so as not to take too much time:

In our examination of offices and agencies in the field we were impressed with the fact that employees assigned to supervise the work were qualified by experience in the service and by special training for the responsibilities assumed by them. Our examination in the field influences us in the opinion that the collecting of data and the reporting of it was given serious consideration by postmasters and others and that the data submitted is adequate for the purpose for which it was used.

It is evident that care was exercised in selecting the men to make the tests, and there is also evidence of an endeavor to accomplish such tests at a time when in the best judgment of all concerned a normal or average condition prevailed.

Then, at page 200, here is a paragraph which may be interesting:

In our contact with the officials of the Post Office Department and the cost committee we were impressed with their sincere endeavors to produce a result based on all available facts, uninfluenced by personal or other considerations, and we received an unusual degree of willing cooperation and a hearty response to all of our inquiries and recommendations. This same spirit manifested itself in the field and has gone far in the accomplishment of the results which are so fully set out in the complete report covering the entire investigation.

We were impressed most favorably by the skill evidenced on the part of the cost committee in the development and application of their methods and the ability demonstrated by them in the direction and administration of so large an organization covering so wide an inquiry of accounting and cost finding.

It is our opinion that the data obtained for the purpose can be considered adequate and that it has been used in accordance with the best established practices observed in obtaining similar results in commercial enterprises. The report of the cost committee reflects a fair and reasonably accurate approximation of the relative revenues and expenditures applicable to the several classes of mail and special services.

I read that so that it may be a matter of record that this is not a mere guess, though it must be, as such things always will have to be, a matter of approximation. Let us suppose that here goes a mail train, laden with mail, some of it letters, some of it circulars, some newspapers; some going here and some there. It is a very difficult problem to work out the relative costs. The point I make is that after years of most intensive study, with the greatest care, these results have been reached, as indicated in the table which I have already asked to have printed as a part of my remarks.

Mr. DALE. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Ohio yield to the Senator from Vermont?

Mr. WILLIS. I yield.

Mr. DALE. Of course the Senator knows that it is shown in the report that certain classes of mail are carried at a loss, because some of it goes at a preferential rate because it

is religious, educational, or scientific, and that the parcel-post service is carried, even though at a loss, because of its advantage to the public. In raising this revenue where would the Senator make up this loss; on the other classes of mail?

Mr. WILLIS. I am very glad my friend the Senator from Vermont has asked that question. I do not have the honor to be a member of the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads. I do not have expert knowledge. That is perhaps already evidenced from what I have said. But I want to say frankly to the Senator that, in my opinion, the cost of handling franked matter or penalty matter ought not to be charged to the Post Office Department. It ought to be carried as a matter of appropriation. In other words, I do not think it is fair to charge that expenditure to the other classes of matter.

Mr. DALE. That is the point I was making in connection with the matter. Then, if the Senator agrees that it ought not to be charged to those classes of mail, where is he going to raise the revenue except from a general appropriation?

Mr. WILLIS. As to those two particular classes of mail, I think they ought to be carried on the books in a way to be provided for from general appropriations, and not charged to the other classes of mail matter. I invite the Senator's attention, however, to the fact that that does not go relatively very far, because the loss on franked matter is \$357,000 and on penalty matter is \$6,214,000, which makes a total of approximately \$6,500,000. Yet as a matter of fact the deficit for the year is some \$40,000,000. I think the Senator is right in inviting attention to that particular matter.

Mr. DALE. I want to follow the Senator's very able argument in this matter, but he puts me in the position where I can not quite do it.

Mr. WILLIS. I am sorry.

Mr. DALE. The Senator's statement in the beginning was that he thinks the revenue should be raised before the salaries are raised, but he agrees with me that it is practically impossible to raise the revenue in the Post Office Department.

Mr. WILLIS. I do not agree with my friend in that respect at all. I hope I have not expressed anything in words that would give a foundation for that understanding. I am saying to the Senator that in my judgment, while I notice the cost accountants do not agree with my most humble opinion, the cost of sending the penalty matter and franked matter ought not to be charged to the Post Office Department. I do not think that is a fair way, although I notice in the report it is so done. But that is only a small item. That is nothing compared to the tremendous loss on the other items. What I am getting at is that if we are to have postal salary increases, which I think we ought to have, there ought to be some effort at least to raise the needed revenue by a readjustment of postal rates.

Mr. DALE. The Senator said that is a small matter.

Mr. WILLIS. Relatively. It is of great importance to me, though it might not be to the Senator from Vermont. It is \$6,000,000.

Mr. DALE. There is no way in the world we can tell the cost of carrying franked matter.

Mr. WILLIS. I am simply taking the estimate that appears in the official report, which is as nearly accurate as we can get.

Mr. EDGE. Mr. President—

Mr. WILLIS. I yield to the Senator from New Jersey.

Mr. EDGE. I understood the Senator to say the deficit was \$6,000,000.

Mr. WILLIS. I think I said that was the amount. Franked matter is \$357,000 and penalty matter \$6,200,000. That is what appears in the report at page 189.

Mr. EDGE. In the same report for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1924, the annual report of the Postmaster General, page 42, under the subchapter "Free mail privilege"—I read it in my remarks a little while ago—it is said that from the information obtained as a result of the count made, which was an estimate, it is estimated that 450,000,000 pieces of matter, weighing 96,000,000 pounds, were mailed free under the penalty privilege, the postage on which at the ordinary rates would amount to \$12,842,659. I can not reconcile the two statements.

Mr. WILLIS. Nor can I; but I am taking the document I have here. I have Senate Document 162 and I am reading at page 189, as follows:

Penalty matter, \$6,214,000.

The Senator can see with his own accurate eyes that I am reading it correctly.

Mr. EDGE. I am reading from the report of the Postmaster General himself, and I do not know what other authority to apply to.

Mr. WILLIS. That perhaps can be explained by the postal authorities. At all events, I think neither figure is material to the argument I am making.

Mr. NORRIS. Mr. President—

Mr. WILLIS. I yield to the Senator from Nebraska.

Mr. NORRIS. I am moved to interrupt the Senator by a suggestion I got from the Senator from Vermont [Mr. DALE] in his question. It does not seem to me the Senator from Ohio has made that plain, at least not to me. The Senator from Vermont asked a question that applies not only to franked mail and penalty mail but, as he specifically said, it applies to mail that is given a preferential rate, such as religious magazines, scientific magazines, and so forth. I think he might have added another item in the Post Office Department—rural free delivery mail—all of which make up a part of the general loss. I would like to ask the Senator if he expects not only penalty mail and franked mail but the mail mentioned by the Senator from Vermont can be separated from the general business, and I would like to add to that the question whether he expects to separate the rural free delivery mail and whether, as to newspapers and magazines, there shall be postage rates sufficiently high to pay it all?

Mr. WILLIS. I think that is a fair question, and I will answer it as fully as I can. I do not think it is possible to do more than reach an approximation of figures. My own information, as brought out by the inquiry submitted by the Senator from Vermont, is that particularly in the case of the franked matter and penalty matter it ought not to be charged to the Post Office Department. As to the other matters, such as religious publications, as I recall under the bill introduced by the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. STERLING], and reported on Saturday last by the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. MOSSES], that objection is removed, but I think that is a relatively minor matter. There are some big, outstanding facts.

We know that third-class matter is carried at a tremendous loss. We know that second-class matter is carried at a big loss. It seems to me that we should at least make an effort to make an adjustment of this expenditure rather than to shovel into the Treasury and take out of the general funds of everybody and put an additional burden upon the taxpayers and not upon those who use the service.

Mr. NORRIS. If the Senator will permit another interruption, the classes of mail suggested by the Senator from Vermont, to which I have added the other items, particularly second-class mail matter, are the ones that make up the great big losses in the Post Office Department. I supposed that was conceded. There is a great loss on second-class mail matter.

Mr. WILLIS. Yes; some \$74,000,000.

Mr. NORRIS. Does the Senator think we ought to charge a high enough rate on that particular matter to make up the deficit?

Mr. WILLIS. I would doubt that, if I understand the Senator's question.

Mr. NORRIS. Then why not take that part of it out and make appropriation to cover that specifically?

Mr. WILLIS. Did the Senator mean whether we should charge on religious and scientific publications?

Mr. NORRIS. Yes; I included those as well as other second-class mail matter.

Mr. WILLIS. That opens up a great question of policy.

Mr. NORRIS. Would the Senator charge a higher rate for a letter or a parcel or a paper that is delivered on a rural free delivery route than when delivered in town?

Mr. WILLIS. No; I do not think that would be practicable. I think that question has been settled.

Mr. NORRIS. If we make every particular mail service pay its expenses, we would have to do something of that kind.

Mr. WILLIS. I have tried to be rather explicit and say that I recognize it is not possible under any human system of accounting to do more than reach an approximation, but when it is here proposed, in the face of a deficit of \$40,000,000 a year, without any effort to get more revenue, that we are to add \$70,000,000 more without the slightest attempt to distribute that burden upon the service—we are to take it out of the general funds—it is perfectly apparent to me that we are not doing what we ought to do if we are to deal with this thing in a businesslike way.

Mr. EDGE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WILLIS. I am anxious to conclude, but of course I will yield to the Senator from New Jersey.

Mr. EDGE. The Senator persists in referring to a deficit in the neighborhood of \$40,000,000, and I thoroughly appreciate he has some authority in the table to that effect. But I am sure that he ought to follow the statement put in the record by the Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE] and also by myself, which rather indicated that with the present business there will probably be a surplus this year. It is hard to reconcile ourselves again to the divergent reports from the Post Office Department, but the fact remains that past statements have demonstrated that every salary increase has been absorbed within from one to three years in the ordinary business of the department.

Mr. WILLIS. That leads me to the question of absorption, about which the Senator spoke previously and to which he now refers. I am unable to reach quite the conclusion the Senator reaches. I have the figures from 1920 on. In 1920 there was an excess of expenditures of \$38,000,000, in 1921 of \$73,000,000, in 1922 of \$59,000,000, and in 1923 of \$39,805,000.

I realize it is rather an unsatisfactory matter to discuss when only the Senator and myself can see the chart; but the chart shows very definitely that up to about 1918, or perhaps 1917, revenues and expenditures kept very closely together; but since 1918 they have been getting further and further apart all the time, and it is to be noted that about that time the salary increases were made. It is apparent, of course, if we are going to increase expenditures \$68,000,000 a year, that it is perfect folly to assume that is going to be taken up by absorption. It has not been done in the past and there is no reason to suppose it will be done in the future.

Mr. EDGE. It is purely a matter of business whether it will be taken up by absorption or not. I can only repeat from the Post Office Department report for the year 1921, which represents the last salary increase, which occurred in 1920, and up to this time. It was then \$157,000,000, which included other extraordinary expenses.

Mr. WILLIS. When does the Senator say there was a deficit of \$157,000,000?

Mr. EDGE. It was gradually reduced until—

Mr. WILLIS. When was there a deficit of that amount?

Mr. EDGE. That was in 1921.

Mr. WILLIS. On page 11 it shows that the deficit for that year was \$73,000,000.

Mr. EDGE. Let us go to another page.

Mr. WILLIS. I will give my authority and go on. Page 11 of Senate Document 162 shows that the excess of expenditures in 1921 was \$73,483,000.

Mr. EDGE. The Post Office Department's annual report for 1921, on page 10, under postal finances, after explaining the amount of money-order profits, and so forth, says that there was a total deficiency of postal revenues of \$157,517,688.11.

Mr. WILLIS. At all events I have the later report. My recollection is that I have already had permission to have it printed as a part of my remarks so that Senators may have it before them.

Mr. BROOKHART. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WILLIS. I should like to conclude, but I must yield to my friend from Iowa.

Mr. BROOKHART. The Senator mentioned a divergence of expenses and receipts, and I think something ought to be said explaining the cause of that. For instance, rents and supplies went up 100 per cent and the contracts with the railroads in carrying the mail went up about 85 per cent, and there was no increase in the postal rates at all to meet those additional expenses, was there?

Mr. WILLIS. No; there has been no increase, so far as I know.

Mr. BROOKHART. So we changed those items of contract and expense for service without paying any attention to the rates.

Mr. WILLIS. I have no idea, of course, that all the increase in expenditure was due to salaries. I do not believe that it was. I was combating the idea advanced by the Senator from New Jersey that we could just coolly add an expenditure of \$70,000,000 a year without making any provision for revenue and that it all would be taken up by some sort of absorption.

Mr. BROOKHART. If we go ahead and make provision for increasing the pay of railroads and increasing rents and supplies and all those things, are not the men who are doing the work in the service entitled to as good treatment as the railroads?

Mr. WILLIS. The Senator overlooked the fact that there have been increases. If he will refer to the President's message on page 2—and I was about to refer to it and I do so only because reference has been made to it by the Senator from New Jersey—he will find that the President in his message points out that—

The Government has been solicitous of the welfare of postal employees. Their compensation has been the subject of several recent legislative acts and adjusted to scales of pay as favorable as any in the public service. The act of July 2, 1918, increased the compensation of clerks and carriers in post offices and railway postal clerks \$200 a year, and rural carriers \$240 a year.

Mr. BROOKHART. At that point let me ask the Senator did we stop and tie that onto an increase of postal rates, making it a condition at that time?

Mr. WILLIS. I do not think so.

Mr. BROOKHART. Why should we do it now, then?

Mr. WILLIS. I do not care anything about that; but I contend when we are proposing to make such a tremendous increase in expenditures as is here involved, as a simple business proposition, when we have before us a showing as to deficits, that we ought to make some effort to collect the money from the people who get the service and not from the general taxpayer.

Mr. BROOKHART. Yes; but the Senator has pointed out that part of that deficit was caused deliberately, because of the policy of carrying religious and scientific matter at less than cost, and also rural-route deliveries, and so forth.

Mr. WILLIS. That also is a great question to be discussed.

Mr. BROOKHART. The services to which I have referred ought to be paid for by the public; they ought not to be put onto some other part of the Postal Service; and yet the Senator is asking us to go ahead here and put the cost in this instance on some other part of the service without any determination as to what it amounts to, or anything of that kind.

Mr. WILLIS. I am asking the Senate to take up the bill introduced by the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. STERLING], and which has been here reported; and if the Senator from Iowa can offer an amendment that will improve the measure in any respect, I shall be glad to support it. My contention is that we have not done our duty as members of the board of managers of this great corporation, which we in a sense represent, if we do not at least make an effort to raise the money by reasonable readjustment of rates rather than simply to take the scoop and shovel the cost from the general fund, which must be produced by levying taxes upon the general taxpayers of the country, particularly when the report shows us so clearly how additional revenue may fairly be obtained.

Mr. BROOKHART. Proper investigation of the matter might show that the cost ought to be paid by the public.

Mr. WILLIS. I can understand how the Senator might take that view, because he believes that. He might believe—I do not say that he does—that it would be desirable that all of the post-office service should be free. I would not take that view of the matter.

The Senator might believe that it would be desirable eventually that common carriers should be controlled by the Government and should render their service free. I take the contrary view; that it is the business of the people who enjoy the service in the long run to pay for that service. I do not believe in the governmental ownership and operation of railroads.

Mr. BROOKHART. I understood the Senator to accede to the view that low rates ought to be accorded to religious and scientific publications, and also to rural routes.

Mr. WILLIS. I am firmly convinced, as I stated to the Senator from Vermont [Mr. DALE] that it is not fair to charge penalty matter and franked matter to Post Office expenditures. Now, if the Senator will permit me, I should like to proceed.

Mr. President, I want to be understood as being in favor of salary increases, but if increased postal salaries shall not be secured it will be, in my humble judgment, because of the mistaken policy that has been followed by those in charge of this legislation. They have taken the position, "No; we will do nothing toward the increasing of revenue; we have the power to pass this bill over the presidential veto, and we will simply ride roughshod." We shall see whether that policy will win. I do not know, but I do not believe that this bill will be passed over the President's veto. So believing, I think, as one who is favorable to postal salary increases, that the sensible thing to do would be to take the proposition which has been brought in here by the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. STERLING], and which has been reported by the com-

mittee. If it is necessary that it should be amended, amend it and pass it. I believe in that way we can get what we ought to have—reasonable increases of postal salaries. I do not believe that we will get such increases by insisting on the effort to pass this bill over the Executive veto.

Mr. DALE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Ohio yield right there?

Mr. WILLIS. Certainly I will yield. I am desirous of concluding my statement, but I will yield to my friend from Vermont.

Mr. DALE. I wish with all possible courtesy to the Senator from Ohio to take issue with him on the statement that the committee in charge of this bill has ever occupied the position in the least degree that they would pass the bill without any consideration whatever of the raising of revenue.

Mr. WILLIS. Mr. President, I entirely absolve the Senator from Vermont from any such view as that. I said those who were in charge of the bill; I do not know just exactly the words I used, but the ones I had in mind, to be frank, are the friends of the postal salary bill outside of the Senate, to whom I have talked by the hundreds. I have stated to all of them by correspondence and in personal interviews and in appearing before some of their committees that the wise way to handle this question was by the method I have indicated; lay the veto proposition over and undertake to frame a bill which would meet the objections which the Executive suggests. However, I absolve the Senator from Vermont from anything of the kind which I have stated.

Mr. DALE. Let me ask the Senator from Ohio if, in his humble judgment, the veto of the President shall be sustained at this time there is a ghost of a chance of the postal revenue bill passing during this Congress?

Mr. WILLIS. If the Senator will permit me to say so, if the friends of the bill—and I will now broaden the statement, and say whether they be inside the Senate or out of it—if the friends of better salaries for postal workers would go to work upon the lines indicated in the bill introduced by the Senator from South Dakota, I think their chance for success would be very much greater than it will be if insistence is made that this bill shall be passed over the presidential veto, because frankly I think it will not be so passed.

Now, Mr. President, if I may be permitted to proceed hurriedly to a conclusion—

Mr. FESS. Mr. President, will my colleague yield to me?

Mr. WILLIS. I yield to my colleague.

Mr. FESS. Reverting to the question of the Senator from Vermont [Mr. DALE], if the President's veto is not sustained, how much of a chance would there be to enact the bill providing for increased postal revenue?

Mr. WILLIS. What is the opinion of the Senator upon that point?

Mr. FESS. I think there would not be a ghost of a chance.

Mr. WILLIS. I agree with my colleague absolutely on that proposition.

Mr. DALE. Mr. President, if the Senator will yield just once more to me, the two Senators from Ohio are raising another issue here; they are raising the issue of revenue. The committee behind this bill simply raised by the bill the one cold issue that these employees were not paid enough, and that any institution, no matter what its revenue was, ought at least to have manhood enough to pay its employees a living wage. That is the only question that is primarily before the Senate now.

Mr. WILLIS. If I may be permitted to say so, with the greatest of good feeling, I think those who have insisted that the vote shall be had upon the veto message—and I am ready to vote upon that any moment that it is desired to have a vote—have raised something else besides the mere question to which my friend from Vermont has adverted; they have raised something that I shall not name with reference to the hopes of the postal employees for better salaries.

Mr. DALE. We did not raise it.

Mr. WILLIS. As I have said, I absolve my friend, the Senator from Vermont, but I do say that if this whole proposition is to be defeated, in my judgment, it will be because those who have had charge of this matter have insisted that nothing shall be done to meet the postal deficit, but that the burden shall be coldly shouldered upon the taxpayers of the country and not upon the users of the service.

Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Ohio yield to the Senator from Massachusetts?

Mr. WILLIS. I think I will have to yield to my friend, as I have yielded to every one else, but very soon I am going to quit yielding and also quit talking. I yield to the Senator from Massachusetts.

Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts. I am sorry to have to ask the question of the Senator, but he has several times referred to the friends of the postal salary increase measure. Whom does he mean by friends or enemies of the measure? The vote when this question was before the Senate was 73 to 3. Now, who are the friends and who are the enemies of the postal employees' salary increase bill?

Mr. WILLIS. If the Senator wants to get my personal position, that is perfectly well known. I, of course, was one of the feeble three that, for reasons which I stated, and as to which I have not and shall not hedge, voted against the bill, and I am not ashamed of my vote now.

Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts. Does the Senator think that the 73 friends of the bill should yield to the opinion and views of its 3 enemies?

Mr. WILLIS. Whatever they should do, if the Senator wants my opinion—and it amounts to nothing upon this question, and his view is just as good and perhaps better than mine—I think this bill will not be passed over the veto of the President; I do not believe it will; I may be mistaken about that. It is not, however, a question of yielding. Of course, the Senator knows it is a question of each one of us doing the thing that in his judgment seems fair and wise, and in the public interest.

The Senator from New Jersey [Mr. EDGE] in response to a question that was asked by the Senator from Connecticut made reference to comparative salaries. I was wondering whether the Senator from Connecticut had noted the comparison that is made at page 2 of the President's veto message. I ask permission, Mr. President, in order to save time to have printed at this point in my remarks all of page 2 of the veto message mission, Mr. President, in order to save time, to have printed public is good" and including all of that page. It will give the information.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the matter will be printed in the Record.

The matter referred to is as follows:

The postal service rendered the public is good. The service conditions under which the employees perform their duties are probably more satisfactory than ever before in the history of the Post Office Department. The Government has been solicitous of the welfare of postal employees. Their compensation has been the subject of several recent legislative acts and adjusted to scales of pay as favorable as any in the public service. The act of July 2, 1918, increased the compensation of clerks and carriers in post offices and railway postal clerks \$200 a year and rural carriers \$240 a year. In addition there were increases in compensation to a large number of the supervisory force. The act of November 8, 1919, further increased the compensation of postal employees from \$100 to \$200 per annum. This was followed by the act of July 5, 1920, which provided further increases in compensation ranging from \$200 to \$300 for clerks and carriers and railway postal clerks and \$260 for rural carriers. Substantial increases were also provided in the salaries of the supervisory force, ranging from \$200 to \$600 a year.

The effect of these increases in salary grades over those for the fiscal year 1918 was an increase of \$600 to clerks and carriers in post offices, \$500 to railway postal clerks, and \$600 to rural carriers.

By reason of these increases the Government has paid out during the fiscal years from 1919 to 1923 an additional aggregate of \$450,000,000 in salaries to postal employees above what would have been paid under the scale in effect before these changes, as follows:

During the fiscal year 1919	\$33,202,600
During the fiscal year 1920	68,901,000
During the fiscal year 1921	110,756,000
During the fiscal year 1922	114,258,000
During the fiscal year 1923	128,258,000

It is apparent that the Government has dealt generously with this service.

As a result of these readjustments the average salaries for 1923 are—

Post-office clerks, \$1,751, increase of \$919 since 1909, or 110 per cent.

Post-office carriers, \$1,752.83, increase of \$862 since 1907, or 96 per cent.

Railway postal clerks, \$2,107, increase of \$946 since 1907, or 81 per cent.

Railway postal clerks, including travel allowance, \$2,292, increase of \$1,131 since 1907, or 97 per cent.

Rural carriers, \$1,849.52, increase of \$1,140 since 1907, or 160 per cent.

The average for all salaries of clerks now receiving from \$1,140 to \$2,040 per annum in the clerical, administrative, and fiscal services in all the departments in Washington will be approximately \$1,554 on July 1, 1924, under the provisions of the classification act of 1923. It is thus seen that the lowest average of the salaries of the postal employees in the field service is nearly \$200 more than the average for employees in the Government departments in Washington.

Mr. WILLIS. The specific point about which the Senator from Connecticut asked is covered by this statement of the President in his veto message:

The average for all salaries of clerks now receiving from \$1,140 to \$2,040 per annum in the clerical, administrative, and fiscal services in all the departments in Washington will be approximately \$1,554 on July 1, 1924, under the provisions of the classification act of 1923. It is thus seen that the lowest average of the salaries of the postal employees in the field service is nearly \$200 more than the average for employees in the Government departments in Washington.

I assume that that statement is correct, otherwise the President would not have made it.

Now, Mr. President, there are just one or two other matters to which I wish to refer. If it is assumed that there is absolute unanimity of opinion amongst the postal employees themselves as to the course which is marked out here, I beg to say that Senators are mistaken in that view.

For example, I have here a letter from a postal worker in my State. For obvious reasons I shall not give the name of this man, because it might subject him to embarrassment, for there has been great organization and a great propaganda on this subject. What does he say? I will read a paragraph from his letter:

Soon after Congress convenes there will come before them the new bill—

The new bill—

providing for the increase in salaries for the postal employees, and also to raise the rates of postage to meet the deficit incurred. Personally, and in behalf of the post office clerks of—

Naming the city where he is a clerk, and he is a very prominent one—

I respectfully request your support of this bill. We feel both measures of the bill are merited and almost a necessity—

And so on.

Here is another letter from a postal employee:

Surely the public can see no good reason why postage should not be increased, as everything else has doubled, and postal employees' wages have not been increased for a long time.

Here is what another postal employee says:

As I understand, it has never been denied that the bill referred to above—

That is, Senate bill 1898—

is no more than just; but the paramount issue is in raising this necessary fund to take care of the bill, which in my estimation is a very poor excuse for not giving the employees justice.

I am reading all that he said.

But thanks to Senator STERLING, who has come to the rescue with a bill which should overcome the aforesaid obstacles. While in my estimation the bill of Senator STERLING would undoubtedly work a hardship on the publishers of second-class mail, yet if that is necessary to promote justice I feel, and I think you will agree with me, that you would be only doing justice by supporting these bills.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from Ohio has expired.

Mr. WILLIS. I ask permission to print in the Record, at the close of my remarks, certain documents.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. WILLIS. Not all the newspapers are agreed that the bill for raising revenue is unfair or unwarranted. For example:

The Akron Beacon Journal on December 10 says this in its editorial columns:

During the last year the Post Office Department ran approximately forty millions behind. To take the sum needed to give the postal people what they should have would be a serious blow to any further reduction of taxes next year. * * * We are now going to get into trouble with some of our newspaper brethren. As a usual thing the publisher is almost as irresponsible a fraud as is the Congressman. In other words, while he will never admit that he does anything except for the glory and good of the common cause, he is in fact busy buttering his own parsnips all the time. Consequently at this juncture we

find him sitting on the congressional crupper yelling and beseeching that august body for the love of education and Mike and the public good not to increase postal rates. Now as a matter of fact postal rates should be increased, especially on all second and third class matter. We say this because the loss in the Post Office Department is caused exactly by this class of matter. No other government in the world would think of transmitting such matter at such a cost. It is only necessary to call the attention of any business man to one day's mail to illustrate the point we would make. All kinds of utterly worthless rot cumbers it. A thousand societies or organizations are trying to make the world safe for some thing or other in which the public has no more interest than they have in the social progress of Timbuktu.

The grandiloquent virtue of gaudy corks plasters flutter from an employee that Uncle Sam has carried to its fatal destination a loss. Fakes and fakirs, as well as saints and uplifters, all lard the lean earth with the particular twists they are taking at the ears of error, and it is all done at an enormous loss to the Post Office Department, and consequently to the taxpayers of the country. Nine-tenths of this stuff is worse than useless. Not 1 per cent of it is ever read. Yet under some weird damphool idea about education conceived when Horace Greeley was a boy the country has been deluded into the belief that the public should sustain this loss. We do not think so, and we are confident the people do not think so.

No business in the world outside of Government would tolerate the lunacy that now prevails in this regard. The post office should be placed not only on a self-sustaining basis, but it should charge enough for its services to raise all the revenue needed to pay its employees a decent American wage. There is no necessity of raiding the Treasury to do it. All that is necessary is to quit carrying the millions of tons of junk annually at a loss, and to add to the cost of transportation enough to balance the postal budget, including the pay of employees.

On December 19 the Mansfield News said, in part:

The report of the Postmaster General, a former newspaper man and publisher, shows a deficit of \$74,712,868.67 in second-class service. Of this amount \$34,474,630 is charged to the distribution of daily newspapers, \$20,112,153 to weekly newspapers, \$14,951,858 to agricultural, trade, and scientific periodicals, and \$4,612,233 to magazines and all others.

The committee of the American Newspaper Publishers' Association proposes to fight General New's recommendation that postal rates be readjusted to overcome this deficit and is asking publishers to contribute 1 per cent of their annual second-class postal bill to provide funds for the proposed opposition.

The News does not favor a fight on the measure and does not intend to make the contribution asked for. It does not see how any newspaper can make any just claim for any special privileges from the Government or any other institution. It believes that if the postal rates are too low, they should be readjusted to overcome any deficit and to take from the public the burden that the publishers themselves should carry.

The publishers are not within their rights to go before Congress and insist upon a postal rate lower than cost. They can not with good grace and with fairness try to sandbag Members of the House and Senate into accepting their point of view by threats of the use of the public press for or against them. When the publishers' association uses its machinery to thwart economy or to gain special rates, it becomes a bloc of detriment to public good and welfare and joins the class of lobbyists against whom there have been long and just protests.

They have no more right to a claim of a postal rate lower than cost than the postal workers to a wage increase which is not justified now under present postal revenues. They have no more right to this special rate than any other class. They are insisting upon a scheme of rates that, if carried out, would bankrupt the Treasury and wreck the Postal Service. They must expect to bear their share of the burden.

And the New York World says, in its issue of December 19:

NO SUBSIDIZED PRESS

Objection is made in discussion of postal-pay bills that the Post Office Department is run at a loss; that \$80,000,000 profit made by carrying letters is more than offset by deficits in the money-order and registering work, in carrying third-class mail, and especially in the delivery of second-class matter, newspapers and magazines.

It has always been the American theory that this phase of postal work is educational; that the spreading of information through the mails justifies some loss of revenue in that branch of the postal work. Now, it is suggested that higher rates be charged in the activities which are conducted at a loss, so that wages may be raised without incurring any deficit. If the opinion prevails in Congress, as it does in the White House, that this should be done, the World, for one, has no objection.

We have been until now in accord with the general opinion that the circulation of periodicals at some loss in postal rates was justified by the educational value of that work. If this has led to the crippling of the department or to the denial of a living wage to faithful and hard-working employees, then we are satisfied no longer. To the proposal that rates on all deficit-making postal service be raised the World will offer not criticism but hearty support. It has opposed subsidies and bonuses to farmers, shipping companies, and veterans, and if second-class postal rates have no better justification in public policy than these, then the World is opposed also to this subsidy for publishers.

Let justice be done! There should be no subsidized press at the expense of efficiency. There should be no favors to publishers at the expense of postal workers.

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, I do not rise to discuss the Sterling bill or the committee report on that bill, which was discussed at length in this body on day before yesterday by the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. MOSES]. I may have something to say about the bill, because on to-morrow the debate is limited to 20 minutes, as I understand the unanimous-consent agreement.

I desire to discuss just briefly the motion to refer to the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads the postal salaries increase bill which was vetoed at the last session. Of course, the motion is to refer that bill, with the President's veto message, to the committee. I want to discuss that just a little, and I want to discuss it from the standpoint of the President's veto; and I want to call the attention of Senators on the other side of the Chamber to the fact that while the President of the United States in his veto message has pointed out that there was no provision made for raising the additional revenue necessary to meet the increases in the salaries of the employees in the Postal Department, the President did that in not exceeding 20 lines of a veto message covering three pages of close print; that two full pages, at least, were devoted by the President to the contention and statement that the employees of the Postal Service were not entitled, as a matter of right, to this increase in salary.

Mr. President, we might as well face the issue as it is. The bill introduced by the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. STERLING] and the bill reported by the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads reenacted the salary increase provision of the vetoed bill without a single change in those salaries. In other words, on June 7, 1924, the President of the United States in a veto message three pages in length devoted two pages to the establishment of one proposition, to wit, that the employees of the Postal Service were not entitled to an increase in their pay.

Now, the spokesmen for the administration come back here at the second session of the same Congress and introduce the same bill, carrying the same increases in pay, and we are to understand that the President approves it. We are to understand more than that; we are to understand that the President expects the bill that is now offered to pass Congress at this session; and I want to discuss that phase of the matter.

Of course, Mr. President, I do not speak for the President of the United States, and I do not know whether any Senator on the other side will disclaim authority to reflect the sentiment of the President; but I do know that if we are to understand anything we are to understand that now that the means of raising the revenue has been found, we are privileged and are invited to vote for the same bill which the President at the last session vetoed, not upon the ground alone that we had failed to provide the revenues with which to meet the increase in those salaries, but the burden of his veto message was that the postal employees were not entitled to an increase in their salaries. There are two full pages here, and no Senator can read the veto message without reaching the conclusion that that is the burden of the President's veto; and yet he comes in here now, if Senators who have spoken for him are to be credited as reflecting his present view, and confesses the case in favor of the postal employees by a solemn admission in judicio, as it were. He says that their salaries ought to be increased. He admits their case. He concedes it. He makes it out; and in the face of that solemn admission I do not see how anyone can save his conscience by a refusal to override that veto and accept what? A bill which carries the very same increases of salary, but provides a means of paying them.

Does any Senator believe that that bill can pass at this session of Congress? If the President's veto is sustained, does any Senator believe that the bill which gives to the postal employees an increase in salary and also provides the means for paying it can pass at this session? I dare say that not a

Senator will stand in his place and say that he really believes that it either can or will be done.

We know that this is the short session of Congress. We have been given to understand, time and time again, that unless we get out of the way certain unanimous-consent measures we were going to be subjected to night sessions here; and I take it that no man in this body believes for a moment that if the President's veto is sustained it will be at all possible to pass at this session of Congress a bill which will give to the employees of the Postal Service the increases which the President now supports, if he has approved the bill; and I understand from the press and from what was said by the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. MOSES]—I understand, indeed, from what has been many times intimated here—that he approves this bill. The President now admits the case of the postal employees; he makes it out himself; and, notwithstanding the two pages of his veto in which he said they were not entitled to the increases, he now confesses the case for the employees, and falls back upon the single proposition that since there was no means provided in the original bill for the payment of these increases in salary, now since the cost ascertainment commission has reported, and now that there is a bill before the Senate which provides the increases, the bill therefore has the approval of the Executive.

I may be stating the case a little strongly, but I do not want to do so. I want to state it fairly. I have read this veto message. I have tried to digest it. I do not understand the kind of philosophy which says, if men are not entitled to an increase in salary, "Nevertheless, if you will find somebody's pocket out of which you can get the increase, I will approve the bill." I do not appreciate that sort of philosophy. I know that if the President approves the bill which is now offered, or will be offered as a substitute, he approves the identical salaries which he vetoed. I know that thereby he admits that the salaries of the postal employees as carried in the first bill are just and right, and ought to be paid; and why should we refer back to the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads that bill and the President's veto message?

The case for the employees is made out. The cost-finding commission has reported. A bill has been actually reported which we are to understand has Executive approval. Why should we refer it back? If it does go back, or if the President's veto is sustained, we may be assured that the 351,000 postal employees affected by this bill will receive no salary increases during this Congress.

It is true that the President does talk about some other things in his veto message. It is quite true that he says something about differentials; but that is a part of his argument against the demand of the postal employees. He says that if the postal employees are anywhere underpaid we should find those centers in which the living costs are so high as to necessitate an increase in salaries. In other words, he argues for the principle of differentiation in salaries. The Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads did not see fit to take that view of the matter. We very cheerfully recognize that there is a certain sense in which that suggestion, which was made to us, makes a strong appeal to prevailing and accepted business methods, but for other reasons we reject it; and so far as I am concerned I always will oppose the fixing of postal salaries upon that principle and for reasons that to my mind at least are sufficient.

Then the President does say something in his message here about the cost ascertainment commission and its report, and indicates that that report will furnish a basis for a proper rate readjustment, and he does finally make that argument, and he makes that argument strongly; but the gravamen of his argument, the real weight of his argument, as I have said before, is the argument directed against the claim of the postal employees.

The last session of Congress had not adjourned before somebody was speaking for the President and saying that "The President is not so much against the claim of the postal employees, but he is objecting because no provision has been made for the payment of the increases in their salaries," and so the President himself seems to have adopted that view of it; but he takes the whole foundation from under Senators in this Chamber who really believe that there ought not to be an increase in postal salaries, regardless of whether we have the money to pay that increase. He removes that argument, and if the bill now on the calendar means anything, and newspaper reports are to be credited, we stand here with the solemn admission of the Executive himself that this increase in postal salaries is right, is just, is fair, and is equitable.

There is no argument by which you can evade that clear statement of this case. If Senators are in earnest, will they not say, "If you sustain the President's veto, we will then pay the very same rates of salary provided in the vetoed bill, but at the same time we will meet the President's objections and provide the means for paying those salaries."

There is the case. Will you send the bill back to the committee? If so, for what reason? For almost the first time in the history of the postal system of this country the doctrine is now laid down that the postal system must pay its way. That was the British doctrine before the postal system was established in America, and when Benjamin Franklin was the colonial postmaster general he paid the cost of the colonial system out of his pocket, or so much of it as was a deficit. Benjamin Franklin knew, back in those days, the unifying power of the Postal Service in the colonial life of America. If anybody had forgotten it, it was not the men who established this system, and the Postal Service never has gone upon the theory that the service must pay its way, if by that you mean that every branch of that service must pay all of its costs.

We allow franked mails, we allow penalty mails, we make a differentiation in favor of literature for the blind, for the deaf, and for the dumb. More than that, we have established a foreign mail service. We have been the leaders in that great service to the world, and we know we are granting a subsidy on all of our foreign mail.

More than that, is there a Senator here who believes that the entire cost of the Rural Free Delivery Service should be borne by that particular branch of the service?

As reasonable Senators, we must know that that service is not paying more than half of its cost, and it is not reasonable to expect that it will pay its entire cost. If we are going to make every branch of the Postal Service pay its whole way, then we will have to go back and reconstruct that service from the ground up. It makes no difference to this Government whether money is taken out of one pocket and put into the other, but it makes a vast difference to the users of the mail when you want to make them pay for the special privileges which the Congress has granted in its determination of a proper public policy with respect to the Postal Service.

Mr. President, I fully agree—and I do not for one moment admit anything to the contrary—that the Postal Service ought to pay its way just as far as practicable, but when you lay down the broad proposition that every branch of that service must pay its way, then you are taking a position that can not be sustained unless you are going to reorganize the whole service.

Mr. McCORMICK. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Georgia yield to the Senator from Illinois?

Mr. GEORGE. I yield.

Mr. McCORMICK. The Senator would distinguish between the Postal Service paying its way and every branch of the Postal Service paying its way, precisely as he would distinguish between a railroad paying its way and every kind of freight paying its way?

Mr. GEORGE. Yes; I would bear that distinction in mind.

Mr. CARAWAY. Mr. President, if it is necessary for a department to pay its way, and if nobody can use it unless it does pay its whole way, then why grant a subsidy to a particular user of the mail and deny it to somebody else?

Mr. GEORGE. You can not do that.

Mr. CARAWAY. There would be no justification for that, would there?

Mr. GEORGE. No moral justification.

Mr. CARAWAY. If some classes of freight pay the cost of hauling and others do not, then the class that does not pay its way gets a subsidy.

Mr. GEORGE. Undoubtedly so. There can be no moral justification for the grant of any subsidy or any free service to any user if we are going upon the theory that the whole service must pay its cost; but I did not so understand the Senator to indicate.

Mr. McCORMICK. When I said it does not pay its way I had in mind freight which would not be carried at all if it had to pay its way. The overhead of the railway is not charged against that specific kind of freight.

Mr. GEORGE. I understand.

Mr. McCORMICK. Because if it were, it would not be carried.

Mr. GEORGE. I thought I understood the Senator.

Mr. McCORMICK. I think perhaps the Senator from Arkansas did not understand.

Mr. CARAWAY. Still, if I may be permitted to say so, if the argument is that a service must pay its entire way, that it is inexcusable to advance the interests of the service unless

it does pay, you can not afford to say that we will let some part of the service not pay its way and levy the cost upon some other part of the service. If it is necessary to use the mails and the entire cost should be paid, then let everybody who touches the service pay for the advantage he gets out of it.

Mr. GEORGE. Unquestionably; I fully agree with the Senator.

Mr. McCORMICK. That is the basis of the rate structure in the Post Office Service and the railway service.

Mr. GEORGE. I think the Senators are not talking about the same thing; but I do not want to stop to settle that dispute between them.

Mr. CARAWAY. We are talking about the same thing.

Mr. GEORGE. I do not want to go into a discussion of the whole question of rate making. I do not at all criticize the cost-ascertainment report. As a cost-ascertainment report it is probably all right in some respects, and in very many respects. I am not criticizing the attitude of the men who made up that report, but it is nothing but a cost-finding report, and I would object, and other Senators will object, when the time comes to making the rates with but one consideration in view; that is, the cost. Cost is an element in rate making, but it is not the whole element. It is not necessarily the controlling element, and in some remotely connected branches of the service—and that is what I understand the Senator from Illinois to mean—it is not even the predominating element in fixing rates. But I am not going into a discussion of the question of rates. I am not going to talk about even elementary principles in fixing postal rates. I am not going to refer to the fact that when you are considering your primary service you necessarily give more consideration to costs than when you are considering the secondary and far-removed branches of that service. I am merely pointing out one thing, and one thing only—that the postal system in America, as we have developed it, has not been built upon the single consideration of cost as a determining element of the rate. It is an important element and I do not want to be misunderstood. It is the most important element, I am very frank to say, but it is not the exclusive element that must be taken into consideration in determining a just rate.

Congress has from time to time fixed rates in the postal system as a matter of public policy, some classes of mail being carried absolutely free and some classes bearing rates that were greatly under what the regular users of the postal system were required to pay. We permit the mail to go out under the franks of Senators and Representatives. We permit the departments to send out their mail free of cost. We permit certain periodicals to go free to the blind, to the deaf, and to the dumb, as I have said, and other periodicals to be sent free. We cheerfully make up the subsidy that is paid to the foreign mail, and I ask again, is there any man who will face the question squarely and who will not admit that you knew and now know that you are furnishing free delivery service in pursuance not of your cost-pay proposition but in pursuance of an established public policy?

I believe it to be a sound policy that every branch of the service should pay its way so far as is practicable and consistent with sound public policy, but beyond that I never will vote for a bill that would require that your income be equivalent to your outgo in the postal system.

That brings me to the only criticism I am going to make of the cost-ascertainment report, which I have read and which I have studied with great care, and that is this, that the cost-ascertainment report as a cost-ascertainment report is a reasonably good report, all of the publishers in this country to the contrary notwithstanding. It furnishes some data and some facts that are invaluable in the fixing of rates, even in the Postal Service. I grant you that. But the trouble about the cost-ascertainment report is this, that consciously or unconsciously it is the finest example of special pleading that I have seen in many a day.

It starts out to establish one contention and one conclusion, and every step taken, every process used, every set of statistics marshaled, all point to that ultimate conclusion, and with admirable skill and ability. It is a species of special pleading. The allocations between the various classes of service are all made with that one dominating conclusion in mind. When you admit the premise you have a magnificent report. When you admit the premise upon which it begins you can not find much fault with it. But its underlying fault is this, that the service must pay its way; that the cost of that service must not exceed the revenue that is brought in by that service; and it does not distinguish, as it should distinguish, between primary services and secondary services, and remote and entirely contingent services rendered by the postal system. It does take into consideration to some extent the policy as estab-

lished from time to time by the Congress, but it does not take into consideration the policy as established by the Congress in the full sense in which that policy has been clearly indicated.

For instance, let me call to the Senate's attention this one fact. It is found in this cost-ascertainment report that parcel post does not serve the farmer. What is the significance of that? The significance of that is this: There is an effort to charge parcel post with an additional cost, but there is an effort, consciously or unconsciously, to charge parcel post with as little cost as possible, because the men in the postal department, if you and I do not know it, know one thing, and that one thing is this, that we established parcel post in America in the exercise of what the Congress thought was a sound public policy. In effect we said, "We will make it pay its way as far as practicable, but we will give to the farmer his packages, whether he pays full cost for the service or whether he does not." Therefore you will find in this cost-ascertainment report that the service rendered by the parcel post is minimized as far as possible. They do not want to make an issue with parcel post.

The same may be said about the Rural Free Delivery Service. The men in the Post Office Department know that when we established rural free delivery of mails we were establishing a policy. We were voicing in that act a public policy, and that policy was that the farmers should receive their mail whether the farmers who used those mails paid all the cost of that service or not. Rural free delivery, according to this report, is costing us \$86,000,000 a year, nearly \$87,000,000. Is that branch of the service paying its way? Not at all. But the effort in the cost-finding report, the cost-ascertainment report, is to minimize the loss from parcel post and free delivery just as far as possible. I do not say that it is intentional. It may be an unconscious effort, but it displays the bent of the minds of the men who drafted the report, and so discloses the special pleading that runs through the report from beginning to end.

That is the situation. Why? Let me emphasize again that the makers of the report know very well that if they were to come to Congress and ask the Congress to make rural free delivery (or parcel post) pay all of its way, and if it appeared that it was now paying only an infinitesimal part of its way, Congress would say at once, "We established this service to serve the farmers of America, and whether it pays its way or not, the service shall go on." Since the day of Benjamin Franklin, who, as I have already said, paid the cost in part of the colonial postal service out of his pocket and hurled back in the face of the mother country the suggestion that a postal system must be measured in mere dollars and cents, and that the people are not to have the postal service unless the people pay all the cost of that service, we have recognized the unifying influence and the educational value, aye, the value to the very liberties of a people, of the distribution of knowledge and of information throughout the United States.

If you want to make the Postal Service pay its cost, the whole service or any branch of it, and all of its cost, then you are under a moral obligation to take away the franking privilege, to take away the penalty mail, to take away the privilege to the blind, to take away the service to the farmer, to take away the subsidy to foreign mail; and if you take away every form of subsidy and special grant under the postal system to-day and wipe it out, there will be a surplus large enough to pay the sixty-odd million dollars that the President of the United States now solemnly admits the postal employees are entitled to receive.

Mr. President, I want to read just a few extracts from the testimony before the subcommittee to illustrate that the parcel post is serving the farmers of the country in a manner that is really worth while, and not in the merely incidental manner that we would be led to believe by a mere hasty review or reading of the cost-finding report. Here is Mr. Stewart. Pretty nearly everybody who is opposed to anything that happens in the Postal Service blames Mr. Stewart. I am not going to blame him. He is a man of most excellent mind. He is a special pleader. His hand runs through the report and he has established as nearly as can be the conclusion to which he himself agrees. He may or may not be right in it, but, consciously or unconsciously, he thinks that he has the correct theory about postal rates in the country and his arrangements in the cost-finding report bear out that theory admirably. On the whole that report is worthy of the confidence and respect of any man who wants to discuss it. I am not going to criticize Mr. Stewart. I am going to read from him. As to parcel post Mr. Stewart said:

The total number delivered was (in 1923) 103,838,156 parcels—

That is, that total number of parcels was delivered by rural carriers—

or 10.3 per cent of the total number originating in the United States during the fiscal year 1923. During July, 1921, there was collected by the rural carriers 1,292,837 parcels, which extended to one year gives a total of 15,729,517 parcels originating on the rural delivery routes, or 1.5 per cent of the total number originating in the United States.

That is expressed here for one purpose—to show that the service rendered by the parcel post to the farmer is negligible. I read further from Mr. Stewart's own testimony, where he said this:

As a further indication as to the final destination of parcel post, attention is called to the fact that during the cost-ascertainment statistical period—September 21 to October 30, 1923—there was a count of all incoming parcels in all the designated third and fourth class post offices for the 30-day period. Applying the average number of parcels received in third and fourth class offices during the 30-day period referred to to all the third and fourth class offices produces totals as follows for the fiscal year:

In all third-class offices	219,490,560
In all fourth-class offices	216,558,880
Total	436,049,440

The figures given above, representing the total number of pieces of parcel post received at all third and fourth class post offices for delivery to patrons of such offices, aggregates slightly over 43 per cent of the total number of all originating parcels. However, it is well to call attention to the fact that the count of pieces referred to includes some pieces which were counted twice in the distribution processes. As to the number of parcels that were counted twice, no data are obtainable. It is the judgment of experienced postal officials that the total number of parcels delivered through third and fourth class offices would approximate at least 35 per cent of all the originating parcels in the United States.

As already pointed out, rural carriers actually deliver over 10 per cent of all the parcels originating in the United States. The delivery service provided by rural carriers does not by any means provide for all the farmers. Many farmers receive parcel post direct from third and fourth class offices and on star routes from such offices. Third and fourth class post offices are naturally rural localities and much of the population of such offices is made up of farmers living within the immediate vicinity. The population of the average third-class office rarely exceeds 1,000; in most instances the population would range from 200 to 400. Fourth-class offices are still much smaller than the third-class offices. Many fourth-class offices could not boast of a population of more than 50 persons.

It is well to call attention to one other feature in this connection as having a bearing on the subject and that is the number of money orders sold in third and fourth class post offices. The records of the department show that the total number of money orders issued in the United States during the fiscal year 1923 was 173,400,000 and that of this number 76,209,227 were issued in third and fourth class offices, or approximately 44 per cent.

Reduced to percentage, it is stated by Mr. Stewart that the percentage of parcel post through these offices is just a little under 44 per cent of all the parcels handled by the Postal Service—and not all of those parcels went to farmers. Mr. Stewart concedes that fact, and any man familiar with the facts will concede it. The vast majority of them went to farmers, and a vast majority of the money orders issued by the third and fourth class post offices were purchased by farmers. Mr. Stewart points out that approximately 44 per cent of all the postal money orders were issued by the third and fourth class offices, indicating again that the farmers used the parcel post to a much greater extent than is indicated by the figures that are produced in the cost ascertainment commission report.

The same is true of Rural Free Delivery Service. The whole thing comes to this: The service rendered by the Rural Free Delivery Service and the Parcel Post Service to the farmer is really worth while and is really a great part and percentage of the total service. I dare say, if we had any way of knowing accurately how much service is rendered through the parcel post to the American farmer, that we would find that they were receiving almost 50 per cent of the total service rendered by that branch of the Postal System. But in figures it is said that it is a little better or in the neighborhood of 11 per cent of the total service. Bear in mind that the one object, if I have justly and properly charged that the cost-finding report is a special pleading, not using the words in an objectionable sense, is to minimize the cost of those grades of service, the particular branches of the service, which the Congress in its wisdom has established as the result of a determination by it of what is a sound public policy—those branches of the service which have been estab-

lished by Congress without regard to the revenue alone which those particular branches of the service will produce.

In addition to what I have already said, what is the real reason why we should now be invited, at the time we increase the salaries of the postal employees, to provide the additional revenue? I have pointed out during the course of the remarks of the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. EDGE], and the figures are to be found in the testimony of Postmaster General New and of Mr. Stewart, that for the fiscal year ending July, 1926, just one year from next July, the Post Office Department itself estimates that on the basis of present expenditure—not, of course, including the proposed increase in salaries, but on the basis of present expenditure—it will be more than self-sustaining. If that is true, what does it come to? It comes to the fact that the Postal Service has from time to time absorbed all of the increases that have been given to the employees in that service by way of salary adjustment. It has taken care of itself through strict economy. Further economies can be effected in the department, and that is clearly indicated when we consider that since the present administration came in the deficit in the Postal Department has been reduced from \$80,000,000 a year to the close of the present fiscal year, when the department itself admits it will have a deficit in operating expenses for the year of not more than \$10,000,000.

What is the use therefore of coupling with the proposal to pay postal employees their just salaries this hasty, ill-considered, unintelligible rate schedule? Mr. President, I believe as a matter of sound legislation, I believe as a matter of sound principle in legislation, that there should be no coupling of the two measures, even if there had been ample time within which to have considered the whole question—and why? My zeal for the postal employees, my desire to give them what they are entitled to have, may warp my judgment which normally and naturally might be against the proposed increases in postal rates. The two propositions ought to be handled on their own merits. The two propositions ought to be considered and determined separately. The constitutions of many of the States—and we can learn very much from the States in our consideration of national legislation—provide that no law shall pass which refers to more than one subject matter. That is a sound provision. In my judgment there is much argument that can be submitted in favor of it.

If we had ample time in which to devise a proper rate schedule, if we had ample opportunity in which to devise a proper rate schedule, if we had ample time in which to satisfy ourselves that we knew what was a just rate to be imposed on first, second, third, and fourth class mail matter, I still would say that we should determine whether postal salaries ought to be increased in the first instance and, as a matter of secondary consideration, of course, to be considered in its proper place, how postal rates should be adjusted.

While I have in mind the question of parcel post, Mr. President, let me call the attention of the Senate to one additional fact. Not only does the parcel post serve the farmer but there have been taken the recommendations of the Post Office Department in this bill which has been considered by the Post Offices and Post Roads Committee with respect to money orders and with respect to C. O. D. delivery, and it is proposed to double the cost to the users of the money order and of the C. O. D. package. Whom do we hit when we do that? We reach back to the farmer; we go back to the same man who uses the third-class office and fourth-class office. We reach the man whom Congress tried to serve when it established the Rural Free Delivery Service, when it established the Parcel Post System. Every time we double the cost of the service rendered by the little third-class office and the little fourth-class office we reach the farmer. When we take a just estimate of how far the farmer is served by the parcel post we come to the inevitable conclusion that more than half or, in all reason, at least half of the service is rendered to the farmer and not merely 10 or 11 per cent of it.

Mr. President, it seems to me that the whole question here is whether or not the postal salaries are now adequate. Let me repeat, the President admits their inadequacy. He now admits the case of the postal employees; he now says, "It is right to give them what I denied them on June 7." There is not a change in that schedule; he admits it; he confesses it.

Not only that, but the bill which has the approval of the President of the United States if we are to accept things at their face value, carries with it another admission, a solemn admission that it is a mere makeshift; that it is neither right nor just to the users of the Postal Service, or, if it is right or just, we do not know it, for it carries with it the solemn admission that it shall be in operation for 10 months only. The whole case for the employees is admitted by the President when he approves the same rate, a horizontal rate of increase

that the President vetoed on June 7. The whole case against the bill now offered by the Post Offices and Post Roads Committee is admitted when the bill on its own face confesses that it is purely temporary, that it does not prescribe either a just rate, or, if it prescribes a just rate, we are not able to say with any degree of confidence that it is just.

Is that the way to legislate? Where is the emergency? Where is the occasion for such legislation as that? What is the reason for such legislation as that? The Postmaster General tells us that at the end of the fiscal year 1925—that is, on June 30, 1925—there will be a deficit in operating expenses of only \$10,000,000. Say that this bill will increase that deficit by \$68,000,000. That will only be a \$78,000,000 deficit, and yet in 1921 the Post Office Department faced a deficit and Congress paid it of \$80,000,000.

Emergency! It does not exist. Justification! It does not exist. The users of second-class mail matter, and the users of third-class mail matter, and the users of the parcel post, and the users of the special services—the cash-on-delivery and the money-order departments of the service—have a just right to complain to this Congress. We know, and we might as well say that if the President's veto is sustained there will be no legislation on the subject at this session, and the farmers who use the Rural Free Delivery Service and the Parcel Post Service and the special services carried in the Postal Department, and the second-class mail users, and even the third-class mail users will not be subjected to this burdensome, this hastily devised, this imperfect and unjust postal rate scheme for which even the Congress apologizes, for which even the Congress says, "We do not know very much about it, and we therefore provide that it is to operate against you only for the short period of 10 months."

Mr. President, there is no occasion for it. I am not able to see why the President should want to deal with the question in this way. Analyzing it as closely as I can, I say there is nothing involved but the delicate sensibilities of the man in the White House, for whom I entertain the most profound respect; but the sensibilities of no man ought to be used as justification or excuse for legislation such as this and under circumstances such as these.

I am going to close, Mr. President, by reading from a telegram—for no one has spoken for them as yet—as to what will happen to the farmers who are served through the parcel post. I read from a telegram from the most responsible seed distributor, perhaps, in the country, a man who has virtually given his life to the service not of himself but to the service of my State, a man not of my State but, as I recall, from one of the New England States, but who in coming early to that State saw what the farmers of my State most needed. Here is what he has to say:

I have discovered that our current issue of seed catalogues, weighing 6 ounces each, would cost \$36,000 to mail under revised Sterling bill—just double present cost. New tax under name of service charge and reduction in weight from 8 to 4 ounces for flat rate of postage most indefensible; also preferential rates for seeds, plants, bulbs, recognized by Congress since 1879, practically wiped out.

Mr. President, let none of us be deceived. If we should pass the Sterling bill in its present form we would have placed upon the users of the parcel post, and in a large measure upon the men and women in the country whom we tried to serve in the establishment of these respective services, a burden which will be very definitely felt. In single instances it may seem small, but it bulks large, and so large on the class of people who already have all the burden they can bear as to preclude them from the real benefits of a service to which they are entitled. There can be no excuse for it nor justification for it, because we have ample time, and there is not a single reason why we should not utilize that time and the opportunity afforded us during that time to work out a just rate bill.

Whatever Senators may say and however the appeal may make itself to individual Senators, as for myself, when the justice and righteousness of the case for the 351,000 postal employees is here and now confessed and admitted, I am going to vote to override the President's veto, and I am going to vote against the motion to refer the bill and the veto message to the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads.

Mr. STERLING. Mr. President, when, on the 16th day of December, I made the motion to refer this bill, together with the President's veto message, to the committee, I thought there existed good and sufficient reason for that reference. Now, after the lapse of time, and in view of what has happened meanwhile, I think the reasons for the reference of the bill to the committee are multiplied over and beyond what they were at the time.

Mr. HARRISON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question in that connection?

Mr. STERLING. I will yield for a question.

Mr. HARRISON. Since the order is fixed to vote on the President's veto to-morrow, what effect would the motion of the Senator have if it should carry? Would it cancel the order which we have for to-morrow?

Mr. STERLING. I think so.

Mr. HARRISON. The Senator thinks it would cancel it?

Mr. STERLING. I think probably it would.

Mr. President, some things have happened since the President's veto message was laid before the Senate on the 7th of June last. There followed the vacation, the political conventions, and the campaign which followed, in which campaign, of course, the veto message of the President was used for the purpose of influencing the vote against the President and against the Republican Party.

We know, Mr. President, how the people responded with that as one of the issues in the campaign. The watchword of the administration has been and is economy in the expenditures of the Government, economy which would result in lessening the burden of taxation on the people of the United States.

We have been charged from time to time with doing things here in connection with this bill from motives of political expediency. It has been said that we are playing politics. Mr. President, I have to say that if that be politics, make the most of it. It is the highest and best kind of politics. The fundamental thing here, speaking about the reasons for the President's veto message, has been as to whether we shall carry out to practice the economy that the administration preached. The people's mandate is that we should, and they protest against an additional burden of \$68,000,000 unless, in the language of the President's message itself, it be under the "plea of urgent necessity."

Mr. President, I must take exception to some things that have been said in regard to the President's message and the quotations from it. The message is not of the purport attributed to it. It does not bear the interpretation put upon it by the Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE], who has just spoken. The President said in his veto message that this bill could not meet his approval unless under the plea of urgent necessity, and then he proceeded to point out that so far as the postal employees were concerned at the time, no urgent necessity seemed to exist.

What did he do in pointing out that situation? He compared the salaries of the postal employees now, after four or five years of continual increases in salary, with what they had been. He compared the salaries of postal employees as they exist now with the salaries of other employees in the Government service. He said:

Their compensation has been the subject of several recent legislative acts and adjusted to scales of pay as favorable as any in the public service. The act of July 2, 1918, increased the compensation of clerks and carriers in post offices and railway postal clerks \$200 a year and rural carriers \$240 a year. In addition there were increases in compensation to a large number of the supervisory force.

Then he calls attention again to a further increase in the year 1919, and to a still further increase by the general postal reclassification act of 1920. I may observe in passing that I had the honor for a time of being chairman of the Joint Postal Commission, and postal employees representing every single branch of the service were before us, and they said that with the passage of the act of 1920 no further increase of wages would be required or demanded; and here, within a period of less than three years, they are demanding now this very substantial increase. I am not here, Mr. President and Senators, to say that it might not be reasonable now, considering the nature of the service, considering the trust involved, and that the cost of living has not been reduced as rapidly as we thought it might be, that there should not be increases as provided in the bill; but I do say that the President was justified in that veto message on the ground that there was no urgent necessity under existing conditions for taxing the people of the United States \$68,000,000. That was the proposition involved.

Mr. EDGE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. FESS in the chair). Does the Senator from South Dakota yield to the Senator from New Jersey?

Mr. STERLING. I yield.

Mr. EDGE. If the bill was incorrect on June 7, then conditions have changed during the interval, if I follow the Senator correctly, so that the bill is correct at the present time?

Mr. STERLING. I will come to that. I have not said that it was not correct at the present time. What I desire to

say is that the President did not say by the terms of his message, what was attributed to him by the Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE].

Mr. EDGE. I understood the Senator to say that he believed the present bill was justified at the present time.

Mr. STERLING. I say, speaking for myself individually, that I am not objecting to the bill now. I am willing to concede that it is reasonable in the salaries that it fixes. I voted for it originally. I shall vote for it again.

Mr. EDGE. I am just wondering what has happened between June 7 and now to make any difference.

Mr. STERLING. If it stood alone as a question of salaries, without provision being made by which to pay the salaries, it would be a different proposition; but here, as might be implied from what the President said, we have prepared a new bill, leaving the salaries in every particular just as they were in the original bill vetoed by the President, and providing the means by which the salaries shall be paid.

Mr. President, is it reasonable that we should provide these means or attempt to do so? I want to say in passing that all possible expedition has been used to forward this measure, and I think it shows the entire good faith of the Senators who are interested in having this bill referred to the committee and who have been interested in introducing and having considered the new bill. Immediately upon its reference, before the holiday recess, as chairman of the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads, I appointed a subcommittee of that committee for the purpose of holding hearings and reporting to the full committee. The subcommittee heroically went to work and spent nearly every day, at least seven full days during the holiday recess, denying themselves holiday visits and participation in the usual holiday festivities, in order that they might work out a schedule of rates to be a part of the salary bill.

The result of the work of the subcommittee of the Post Office Committee was placed before the Senate on last Saturday by the chairman of the subcommittee having the bill in charge. There was a long discussion. The Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. MOSES], in charge of the bill reported by the subcommittee, was on the floor for, I think, two and a half or three hours. Long colloquies ensued. He made, I think, a very clear exposition of the bill and a statement of the estimates of the revenues that would be produced under the bill; and in the face of what has happened, the work that has been done, it seems to me anything but courageous for the Senate of the United States now to say, with the data we have before us, that we can not pass within the next two months a bill that will meet with the approval of the President of the United States and with the general approval of the country.

What are some of the data? First, we have the cost-ascertainment report; and I believe, whatever criticisms may have been leveled against it, that it is a monumental work, the most thorough and accurate of its kind ever prepared. It is vouched for by the highest authority.

The subject matter of the cost-ascertainment report had been, of course, the subject of investigation and study by Post Office officials long before—notably the study made by the very able Mr. Stewart, special assistant in the Post Office Department. So we have that report. We have the hearings before the subcommittee as another basis. We have the presentation of the bill by the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. MOSES], and the discussion here on the floor.

What is the result of that discussion and these reports? Mainly this, Mr. President; and let me call attention to and emphasize it. I was unable to be in the Senate Chamber more than a few minutes during that day. I came in just as the Senator from New Hampshire was concluding his statement, having been unavoidably detained from the Senate; but I read over that lengthy, that intelligent, that well-directed colloquy here on the Senate floor that lasted for over an hour, and then I said to myself: "In this cost-ascertainment report, in these hearings, in what occurred on the floor of the Senate, lies the groundwork for our further work during this very session in the consideration and passage of this bill." What excuse have we, with the issues thus narrowed, and clarified as they have been by the report, the hearings, and the discussion on the floor already had, for not getting to work upon this bill and passing it?

Senators have said here—the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. EDGE], the Senator from Vermont [Mr. DALE] in a colloquy this afternoon, the Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE]—that it is a hopeless thing; that it has not a ghost of a chance. Why has it not a ghost of a chance? It lies within our will absolutely to say that it has a chance and that it will be brought to a vote before the Senate of the United States. What we will we can do. Let us devote our energies to passing

the new bill with the same zeal that some have shown in trying to override the veto and it will be accomplished.

Mr. President, the hour is growing very late. I started out with the idea of making my remarks very brief, and I intend to do so; but here is a letter that I received from my old home town, Redfield, S. Dak., this very morning, and I want to read it. It shows that this matter is not altogether one-sided. Reading it, I am prompted to ask that we go out into the rural communities of this country, as they are in Illinois, as they are in the two Dakotas, as they are in Minnesota, and many other States, and ask the average man and the average woman if they are willing, without any means being provided for its payment except through general taxation, to have this great increase of salaries made to the extent of \$68,000,000.

Further in that connection, much has been said here—it is a very common matter of debate—that we should not expect each branch of the mail service to pay its way. We do not expect each branch to pay all its way, and as to that most important service, the second-class mail service, we would expect anything else than that it should come anywhere near paying its way. The cost-ascertainment report shows \$75,000,000 of a deficit in the second-class mail service, or nearly that—\$74,712,000, I think, is the exact amount. There is that much of a deficit. The bill which I had the honor of introducing required that \$10,000,000 additional should be paid by the users of second-class mail, leaving nearly \$65,000,000 yet of a deficit. An amendment made by the subcommittee of the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads reduces that still further. Under that amendment second-class mail is supposed to yield an additional increase of not over \$5,500,000, as against a loss of \$75,000,000.

Are Senators proceeding on the theory that the farmer who uses the parcel post to the extent of 11 per cent of parcels carried wants the service for nothing, that he wants a charity or a gratuity? If so, they are mistaken in the temper of the farmers of the United States. They are too proud, too independent, too patriotic to ask that this great Government be at an expense to be borne by all the people to render them a particular and a special service.

I grant that as to second-class mail, which gives information, which carries news, which carries literature, and through all these means is so highly educational to the people of the United States, it may well be carried at a loss. I never anticipated that it should pay its way, nor would I think of framing a bill or voting for a bill that would require that. But it ought to pay a reasonable percentage of that \$75,000,000 which it now loses to the Government.

This is the letter to which I would call attention. It is dated January 2 and reads in part as follows:

MY DEAR SENATOR: I thank you for your letter of the 30th ultimo relative to the salary bill. I am sure that I, and I am quite certain that the other boys—

By "the boys" he means the boys connected with the post office, the clerks, and the rural and city carriers—

realize your position, that it is correct, in that no expenditure should be made unless proper revenue to meet it is provided. Perhaps our wire was not quite explicit. The meaning intended to be conveyed was that we would appreciate support of 1898 or a similar measure. Certainly the service should be made to bear its own expense as nearly as possible. I do not believe that a business such as the Post Office should be supported by general taxation. Those who use the service should pay for maintenance of that service.

Mr. President, I am led to say that the sentiment expressed in the last sentence of that letter is one not at all foreign to the average American citizen. I have here a little summary, without going into detail, of what would be expected to be raised from various sources under the amended bill presented by the Senator from New Hampshire.

From post cards, distinguished from postal cards—and I think Senators are familiar with that distinction, from the discussion the other day—\$12,500,000.

From publications of second-class matter generally, \$4,000,000.

From transient matter—that is, second-class matter—mailed by the individual here and there, and so on, \$1,500,000.

Third class, \$16,000,000.

Parcel post, \$18,000,000.

From the 2-cent service charge, as I have figured it out—though I may be in error in regard to it—\$1,125,000.

Then for the various services—money orders, registered mail, insurance, collect-on-delivery service, and special-delivery service, an aggregate of \$13,624,510.

These all make a total of \$66,749,510, against approximately \$68,000,000 that, under the vetoed bill, would be added as taxes to make up the postal salary increase. I think these figures come a little nearer making up the \$68,000,000 than the esti-

mate furnished by the Post Office Department under the terms of the original bill.

That is about all I have to say. I think Senators who have noted the proceedings from the time this matter was first brought up will realize that those who have had charge of the bill, and the members of the committee to which the bill was referred, have made an honest effort and have acted in entire good faith in trying to bring out a bill that would allow the salary increases provided for in the original bill, and at the same time reasonably provide the means by which those salaries should be paid.

Mr. McCORMICK. Mr. President, in order that the memorandum which I have before me may appear in the RECORD to-morrow, I crave the indulgence of the Senate to make a statement regarding the amendment proposed by the Senator from Nevada [Mr. ODDIE], which goes to the root of the matter, I think, in so far as the smaller daily newspapers are concerned.

An analysis of the effects of the rates in the bill as amended shows that increases in the amount of \$3,501,477.56 would be gained by the department from the first, second, third, and fourth zones, as against decreases in those zones incident to the quarter cent reduction on reading matter of \$406,248.56. The bill as reported to the Senate provides for no increased postage beyond the fifth zone, but rather for decreases in postage on advertising as well as on reading matter beyond that zone. It can thus be seen that all of the increases are confined to the first four zones, in which 99 per cent of the circulation of the smaller daily newspapers is confined.

It is estimated that the large city dailies now send only about 10 per cent of their total circulation through the mails and the charge to them might be estimated at 2½ per cent of their net revenue, as against 25 per cent of the net revenue of the smaller dailies. The small papers' mail circulation is confined almost wholly to the first two zones, which are 150 miles in radius from the office of publication. In New York State alone the average haul of the smaller dailies is about 35 miles. With increases in postage provided only in the first four zones it will thus be seen that the burden will fall almost wholly on the smaller daily newspapers, with no compensating effects from the reduction in postage in the further zones, such as would be enjoyed by the larger newspapers or the periodicals.

With the permission of the Senate I shall append to this statement a table showing the total increase and decrease on reading and advertising matter under the proposed rates. This table sets forth that the net increase which would be gained—mark this—from these rates would be \$642,678.19. This increase is arrived at by subtracting from the gross increase of \$3,501,477.56, the gross reductions incident to the decrease in the rates on advertising in the far zones and the decrease in the rate on purely news matter in all the zones.

It is the opinion of the publishers of the smaller dailies, however, that they will not be able to stand this increase in postage in the zones where they do business, and that the net effect of the bill will be to curtail circulation in such a manner that the users of the long hauls will benefit, whereas the users of the near-by zone hauls will be driven out, and the Government will suffer a net reduction in revenue without any compensating advantage of a net reduction in expenses.

Whether in committee or on the floor, the amendment proposed by the Senator from Nevada demands a consideration which it seems to me has not been given to it by the committee or the Senate.

I submit a table, and ask that it be printed as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Total increases and decreases on reading and advertising matter

Zone	Increase	Decrease	Net increase	Net decrease
1-2	\$2,686,960.26	\$671,740.97	\$2,015,220.19	
3		240,442.26		\$240,442.26
4	814,517.30	203,629.32	610,887.98	
5		165,806.30		165,806.30
6		395,947.08		395,947.08
7		189,015.33		189,015.33
8		992,219.01		992,219.01
	3,501,477.56	2,858,799.37	2,626,108.17	1,983,429.98

Net increase \$642,678.19.

It will be observed that the net increase in the first four zones amounts to \$2,385,665.91, thus making the daily and weekly newspapers bear practically all the increased rates.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Mr. President, the lateness of the hour and a decent regard for my colleagues preclude me

from doing more than merely endeavoring to bring the discussion back to the question that is really in issue here. The question involved is not political in character. It is not the following of a presidential policy, nor is it in any degree a question upon which the two sides of the aisle of this Chamber should in the slightest degree divide. The only thing that is at stake here now is whether the United States of America is big enough, broad enough, generous enough, and decent enough to give a living wage to the employees of the United States of America. There is not any other question which at this time should be argued here at all.

It is nonsense to say, and I say with respect and deference to the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. STERLING], that there was a mandate in the last election of one fashion or another. If there were any mandate in the last election upon the presidential veto it was a mandate against any increase in wages at all. When the President of the United States and the leaders of the administration come here and say that they believe in an increase, then they dispose of any suggestion of mandate that may be made and any argument that they have made thus far upon the measure. To say that it interferes with the policy of economy of the President or a policy of economy of the Republican Party is even more chimerical and nonsensical. There is no economy in borrowing from Peter to pay Paul. If on the ground of economy the bill should not be passed, then it should not be passed at all, but to say that by one kind of taxation indirectly we will raise the revenue with which to pay the increased salaries is to negative at once any question of economy.

I learned long ago, when I was governor of a State, as Senators who have been in executive positions have learned, that where there was a policy that was desired to be put over and where the legislation was inevitable, there was a common and uniform mode by which its defeat was sought, and that was a pretense of agreeing in principle with you, but suggesting that it be done in some other way.

Every man who has had any experience in executive positions has had just that experience heretofore in dealing with public policy or with legislative acts.

Here is a measure that passed the Senate of the United States six months ago by a vote of 73 to 3. What is the change that has come o'er the spirit of your dreams in the last six months? I do not know, Mr. President, where regularity ends and lese majesty begins. I do not care where regularity ends and lese majesty begins. Here is a measure that is just. Here is an increase that no man dares say on the floor of the Senate to-day is not just. Here is an increase in pay that the committee admits is equitable and ought to be passed. Here is a bill increasing the salaries which from the President down every individual connected with the administration now admits ought to become a law, and if it be admitted that it is just and equitable and ought to become the law, then let us have the manhood to pass it. There is only one way to pass it, and that is to vote our independent judgment upon the bill which is before us, veto or no veto, and give to men who deserve it in the postal employment the raise in salary which they so richly deserve.

Mr. NORRIS. Mr. President, I desire to speak only to one class of Senators. I have nothing to say and no fault to find with those who voted against the bill when it was originally passed. I have no criticism to make of the President for vetoing it. I do not find fault either with those who voted for it when it passed originally and who since that time have experienced a real change of heart, and desire and intend now to vote against the bill and support the President in his veto. There remains, however, more particularly on the Republican side of the Chamber another class who voted for the bill when it passed originally and who insist on voting the same way now. It is to that class that I desire now to address a few warning remarks.

Mr. President, I am surprised, I am dumbfounded, I am bewildered, I am almost broken-hearted to see this wonderful exhibition of insurgency within our ranks. If there is one thing more than another that we owe to our great party it is always, under all circumstances and conditions, to obey our leader. We have just passed through a campaign when the slogan was "Stand by the President" and the country has vindicated the slogan, given us a wonderful majority, and now I see already some of those in my own party who show indications at least that they are not going to obey the command and respect the wish of our leaders.

I want to say to you, my friends, as a regular of many years standing, that you are occupying a very dangerous position. [Laughter.] You are on a precipice. You are about to plunge over into what seems in theory to be a beautiful body of

water called the lake of conscientious conviction. You are going to follow, you say, what you believe to be right—obey your conscience. What business, Mr. President, has a Senator with a conscientious conviction or a conscience in which to keep it? I say to you when you plunge off into that body of water, that while it looks inviting, perhaps, from the fundamental theory which you may profess, you will find when you land that the water is awfully cold; and if, perchance, in your mad plunge to follow your conscience, your feet land upon some solid rock and you get your head above the water, you will realize then, if you do not now, my friends, that the first thing you will do will be to raise your hands in pity and exclaim, "Help me, Cassius, or I sink!" But, my friends, we will not help you. We will let you sink. The day of grace will have passed. Now is the hour when you must enlist under the flag of regularity if you want to retain your standing.

Remember, it is only a few weeks ago since we regulars met in solemn conclave and expelled from our ranks four of those who had hitherto been members. It is true we did not notify them. It is true we did it peremptorily, without trial, and without giving anybody a hearing. But I want to call your attention to the danger that you may face if you persist in this insurgent conduct. We expelled them from the Republican Party. We expelled them because they refused to follow our leader in the campaign. Incidentally, my friends, it was the same leader, and he was not pleading half as hard for help then as he is now. We expelled them—think of it! None of them controlled very many votes, as the result showed. They have not done very much damage—a few hundred or a few thousand votes was all. What are you about to do in this mad rush without reason? There are more than one hundred millions population in the country. There are 96 Senators. A Senator's vote means more than a million votes of his fellow citizens. If expulsion is the proper penalty for those who influenced a little handful of votes, what shall happen to you if you carry a million votes away from our leader? Why, my friends, you will not only be expelled from the party, but you will be hanged by the neck until dead, and thereafter you will be deprived of holding any office of profit or trust under the Constitution of the United States.

That will not be all, my friends. You will be decreed to join the Democratic Party and carry water and other liquid refreshments to the Democratic donkey the balance of your days. [Laughter.] I ask you, therefore, to hesitate before you take this mad leap. We as regulars know that it is the duty of a party man not to think, but to obey, and now comes the voice of our leader demanding obedience and demanding that we shall follow.

I know that some of you, if you still are hanging on to that ancient and barbaric theory that a Senator ought to vote his convictions, may wonder just what excuse you can give to your constituents for voting one way to-day after you had voted another way the other day. That has been carefully looked after. Let me say to you that it will be one of the greatest honors that can come to any of you to have your name blazoned all over the country as one who was willing to sacrifice his conscientious convictions in order to be regular and in order to obey, so you can publish your names as voting one way yesterday and a different way to-day for the sake of regularity and party solidarity. That will make you solid with every politician in your State. That will give you assistance from many quarters where you can not possibly expect it by taking another course.

But that, my brethren, is not the only way you can get out of this difficulty, if you feel it is going to be a difficulty. The leaders of our party have prepared a magnificent method of escape from angry constituents. A bill has been introduced here that provides for these same increases. Of course, between ourselves, it is not wrong to admit that everybody knows the bill can not pass and will not pass. It, as a matter of fact, is brought in here by our considerate leaders to give us a safe and easy landing place. We can say to our constituents that, while on a previous occasion we voted the other way, here was a bill that we understood was about to pass providing for the very same increases contained in the bill the President vetoed, and therefore we decided to change our votes in order to be regular and at the same time support the bill that would give the same relief that the vetoed measure would give to the postal employees.

We ought to give some credit to our leaders for thinking of that way of letting us out. We ought to honor them for giving us this easy method of escape. This bill is like a rubber bag filled with air. It affords an easy place to alight. You have all been to the circus, my brethren; you have seen them bring out the elephants and seen the men jump over them and

land on just that kind of a sack. That is what we can do. We will bring out our good old faithful elephant; we will place him between us and this rubber sack; we will leap from the spring board, take a somersault in midair, and land in perfect safety upon the rubber bag on the other side and all is well, all is over. [Laughter.]

But if there be any of you, my dearly beloved brethren, [laughter], who still feel that there may be some danger, let me mention to you the third remedy; one that is absolutely certain; one that can not meet with defeat. If your constituents are so inconsiderate as to remember that you voted one way at one time and a different way at another, and should hold you responsible for it, and go so far and be so unreasonable as to defeat you when you are running for reelection, remember that when you do these things for the leaders, for regularity and for party solidarity, there is always an avenue of escape, there is always a safe place, there is a harbor upon whose placid waters no one can enter except the lame-duck statesmen [laughter], who will be taken care of. So although your constituents may take revenge, you will be able to sail into that harbor, snap your fingers in the faces of the angry ones at home and laugh to your heart's content while you live in luxury and peace in a harbor in a city where there are none but lame ducks, and, therefore, you are assured of good society, to begin with.

My friends, watch our leaders in this matter. Follow those who have always been regular and they will always find a way for you to get out. Watch our friend, the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. STERLING], of whose society, on account of the action of his constituents, we are to be deprived, I am sorry to say, after the 4th of March next. I do not know what his inclinations are; I do not know what his aspirations are; whether he desires further to remain in public life I am uninformed, although his present attitude would indicate that he does. [Laughter.] But if he does, I ask you, my brethren, to watch him about the 4th of March and observe with what confidence he approaches the political "pie counter," and see with what a smiling countenance and light step he goes away laden with the good things of life and with a passport that will take him to the eternal city of peace and luxury in Government service.

Watch our illustrious leader, the Senator from Kansas [Mr. CURTIS]. He is one who never yet has dropped his bread upon the floor buttered side down. [Laughter.] If his constituents should be so unmerciful and so unkind as to defeat him because he voted one way on the salary bill yesterday and a different way to-day, it would not worry him any. What to some might seem to be a dismal journey going up what, after an election, in ordinary parlance is called "Salt Creek," would not bother our illustrious leader. That stream, if he were compelled to steer his canoe on it, would have, as the good old song says, "lights along the shores that never grow dim." He would have no difficulty in landing squarely and fairly upon his feet and going on through into the harbor of the habitation of the lame ducks.

So, my beloved brethren, I hope you will listen to the voice of regularity from those who have lived long lives of regularity, knowing always that while your course may appear to be a little bit wrong or difficult, the best thing to do is to swallow the dose that our leaders tell us is good for us, look as happy as we can, and in due time will come our great reward. [Laughter.]

Mr. COPELAND. Mr. President, I notice that the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. NORRIS] omitted another prominent Member of the Senate who appears to have changed his attitude. I have just examined the Congressional Directory and find that the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. MOSES] may be out of a job two years from now.

I observe that in the desire of Senators to save the face of the President every effort is made to keep the Senate from overriding the veto.

Mr. President, the President of the United States had a perfect right to veto the salary increase bill. He was within his constitutional rights; but why should we necessarily now seek "to save his face"? We also have our constitutional rights, and I can not conceive how it is possible for any Senator, merely because he has had sausage and buckwheat cakes at the presidential breakfast table, to change his vote on this particular matter. So, for myself I am hoping that when we finally get to a vote the veto will be overridden and that the postal employees will have the increase in salary.

Mr. President, why should they not have it? Where have we a more faithful body of public servants than these men? Herodotus anticipated the quality of service they rendered when he said:

Neither rain nor snow nor heat nor gloom of night stays these couriers from the swift completion of their appointed rounds.

We ought to give them this increase; we ought not to dangle them in the air any longer; and I hope that when the matter comes to a vote the Senators who by an almost unanimous vote expressed their determination heretofore will express the same determination now. I trust that the bill which has been put before us simply as a smoke screen to blind the true intent of certain legislators may not have any treatment from the Senate which will indicate a desire on the part of Senators to enact it into law. I hope that when we come to a vote we will give the postal employees the increases in salaries to which they are entitled. Certainly the state of the Treasury indicates that this act of justice can be done without embarrassment to the country.

SEVERAL SENATORS. Vote!

Mr. HEFLIN. I ask for the yeas and nays.

Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts. I rise to a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state his parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts. If the motion of the Senator from South Dakota shall be rejected, will an opportunity be given to-morrow to discuss the question of overriding the President's veto?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair understands that such an opportunity will be afforded. The question before the Senate is on the motion of the Senator from South Dakota to refer the veto message and the bill to the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads.

Mr. HARRISON. Mr. President, I rise to a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Mississippi will state his parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. HARRISON. I asked the Senator from South Dakota a few moments ago if, in his opinion, his motion should prevail and the bill should be sent to the committee, whether or not we would be able then, under the unanimous-consent order, to have a vote to-morrow on the question of overriding the President's veto? It was his opinion that if his motion should prevail we would not have the opportunity of voting to-morrow to override the President's veto? May I ask, what is the opinion of the Chair with respect to that matter?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The present occupant of the chair will not be called upon to rule upon that question unless the matter comes before the Senate when he is occupying the chair.

Mr. NORRIS. Mr. President, there can be no doubt about the answer to the question the Senator has propounded. If the matter is referred to the committee, it disappears from the Senate; we will not have it before us to-morrow; and, of course, we shall not be able to vote on it to-morrow.

Mr. SWANSON. The Senate can not vote on a matter that is not before it.

Mr. HARRISON. When this question was before us previously, I suggested that I would move to amend the motion of the Senator from South Dakota to the effect that the committee be instructed to report back the bill immediately with the recommendation that it be passed notwithstanding the President's veto. However, I do not desire to clog the wheels or to cause any misunderstanding about the matter, and so I shall not offer such an amendment at this time, but shall let the vote come on the straight question of whether or not the veto message and the bill shall be referred to the committee.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the motion of the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. STERLING] to refer the bill and the veto message to the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads.

Mr. HEFLIN, Mr. MCKELLAR, and Mr. SWANSON called for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered, and the reading clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. ELKINS (when his name was called). I am paired with the senior Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. OWEN], and therefore withhold my vote. If I were at liberty to vote, I should vote "nay." I do not know how the Senator from Oklahoma would vote if he were present.

Mr. JONES of New Mexico (when his name was called). I have a general pair with the Senator from Maine [Mr. FERNALD], who, I believe, is absent. I transfer that pair to the Senator from Missouri [Mr. REED] and will vote. I vote "nay."

Mr. RALSTON (when his name was called). On this motion I am paired with the junior Senator from Missouri [Mr. SPENCER]. If that Senator were present, he would vote "yea" and I would vote "nay." I transfer my pair to the junior Senator from Mississippi [Mr. STEPHENS] and vote "nay."

Mr. ROBINSON (when the name of Mr. REED of Missouri was called). I desire to announce that the senior Senator from Missouri is unavoidably detained.

Mr. STERLING (when his name was called). I have a general pair with the senior Senator from South Carolina [Mr. SMITH]. I transfer that pair to the junior Senator from Colorado [Mr. MEANS] and will vote. I vote "yea."

The roll call was concluded.

Mr. KING. Upon this question I have a general pair with the junior Senator from Montana [Mr. WHEELER]. If he were present, he would vote "nay" and I would vote "yea." I am therefore compelled to withhold my vote.

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. I desire to announce that my colleague [Mr. JOHNSON of Minnesota] is unavoidably absent from the Senate on account of illness in his family. If present, he would vote "nay."

The result was announced—yeas 30, nays 52, as follows:

YEAS—30			
Ball	Dial	McKinley	Smoot
Borah	Ernst	Metcalf	Sterling
Bursum	Fess	Moses	Warren
Butler	Greene	Norbeck	Watson
Cameron	Hale	Oddie	Weller
Capper	Harrell	Pepper	Willis
Cummins	Keyes	Phlipps	
Curtis	McCormick	Shortridge	
NAYS—52			
Ashurst	Ferris	Jones, Wash.	Ransdell
Bayard	Fletcher	Kendrick	Reed, Pa.
Brookhart	Frazier	Ladd	Robinson
Broussard	George	La Follette	Sheppard
Bruce	Gerry	McKellar	Shipstead
Caraway	Glass	McLean	Simmons
Copeland	Gooding	McNary	Stanfield
Couzens	Harris	Mayfield	Stanley
Dale	Harrison	Neely	Swanson
Dill	Heflin	Norris	Trammell
Edge	Howell	Overman	Underwood
Edwards	Johnson, Calif.	Pittman	Wadsworth
Fernald	Jones, N. Mex.	Ralston	Walsh, Mass.
NOT VOTING—13			
Elkins	Means	Smith	Wheeler
Johnson, Minn.	Owen	Spencer	
King	Reed, Mo.	Stephens	
Lenroot	Shields	Walsh, Mont.	

So the Senate refused to refer the bill and veto message to the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. CURTIS. I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business.

The motion was agreed to, and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business. After five minutes spent in executive session the doors were reopened.

RECESS

Mr. CURTIS. I move that the Senate take a recess until to-morrow at 12 o'clock.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 5 o'clock and 45 minutes p. m.) the Senate took a recess until to-morrow, Tuesday, January 6, 1925, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nomination received by the Senate January 5, 1925

ASSOCIATE JUSTICE OF THE SUPREME COURT

Harlan Fiske Stone, of New York, to be Associate Justice of the Supreme Court of the United States, vice Joseph McKenna, retired.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate January 5, 1925

UNITED STATES ATTORNEY

Harold P. Williams, to be United States attorney, district of Massachusetts, vice Robert O. Harris, removed.

POSTMASTERS

CALIFORNIA

- Ben Lec, Cazadero.
- John F. Conner, Del Mar.
- Gladys B. Evans, Grafton.
- Mamie L. Royce, Pittsburg.
- Florence M. Cole, Ross.
- Clement J. Nash, San Mateo.
- Marylyn M. Thomas, Stanford University.
- Floyd M. Filson, Tennant.

GEORGIA

- Robert S. Franklin, Adairsville.
- Annie R. Hutcheson, Buchanan.

- Harry P. Womelsdorf, Cartersville.
- Uno L. Carmical, College Park.
- George M. Greely, Decatur.
- Sam N. Thompson, East Point.
- James A. Allen, La Fayette.
- Charles P. Colclough, Maxeys.
- Albert S. J. McRae, McRae.
- R. Gordon Riggs, Register.
- William H. Blitch, Statesboro.
- J. Percy Freeman, Stone Mountain.
- Lansing B. LeRoy, Tignall.
- William C. Griffin, Tunnel Hill.

MAINE

- Lawrence A. Brown, Brunswick.
- Frank P. Freeman, Harrison.

MASSACHUSETTS

- Andrew J. Maguire, Randolph.

MICHIGAN

- Frank A. Cole, Grass Lake.

OREGON

- Earl B. Watt, Falls City.
- William R. Anderson, Milton.

PENNSYLVANIA

- Walter C. Alcorn, Avonmore.
- Adah E. Pettis, Saegerstown.

WASHINGTON

- Albert Maurer, Kelso.
- Birdie L. Crook, Nespelem.
- Pearl B. Burrill, Snopualmie Falls.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

MONDAY, January 5, 1925

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.
The Chaplain, Rev. James Shera Montgomery, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Heavenly Father, we bless and praise Thy holy name for the eternal constancy of Thy goodness and mercy. We thank Thee for life, for its opportunities, and for its wonderful privileges. Do Thou bring us into full and complete harmony with everything that is good and upright. May Thy ways be our ways and may we ask no other reward than Thy approval. Toward the God of all life and wisdom may we turn our thoughts as we take up the tasks of the day. In joy or in pain never allow us to stand alone, and when sorrow comes may it be dissolved into the sunshine of Thy love. For the sake of Jesus, do hear us. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of Saturday, January 3, 1925, was read and approved.

RIVERS AND HARBORS

Mr. LAZARO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the RECORD a letter from General Taylor, Chief of Engineers, on the river and harbor improvements bill, now pending in Congress. It is an answer to an editorial in the Washington Post.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Louisiana asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks in the RECORD by printing a letter from General Taylor, Chief of Engineers. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. LAZARO. Mr. Speaker, under the leave given me to print I submit the following letter written by Major General Taylor, Chief of Engineers, on the river and harbor appropriations:

THE RIVER AND HARBOR BILL

To the EDITOR OF THE POST:

SIR: In your issue of December 22, 1924, under the caption of "Progress and pork," you discuss editorially the river and harbor improvement bill, which is now pending in Congress.

Your editorial was evidently written under a misapprehension as to the character of the bill referred to. You speak of the bill as if it carried an appropriation of \$55,000,000. The bill to which you refer does not carry one dollar of appropriations. It authorizes certain improvements to be carried on with funds which are to be appropriated in the future. As it now reads, even if it should become a law at once, no money can be expended during the fiscal year ending June 30, 1926, on any of the projects which would be authorized. The question of providing funds for carrying on these projects, should they be authorized, will come up again next year before the Director of the Budget